THE CONSECRATION AND SUCCESSION, Of Protestant Bishops justified.

The BISHOP of DURESME vindicated.

And That infamous Fable of the ordination at the Nagges head clearly confuted.

By JOHN BRAMHALL, D. D. Bishop of Derry.

Necesse est ut lancē in libra ponderibus impositis Deprimi, sic animum perspicuis cedere.

GRAVENHAGH, By JOHN RAMZEY, Anno 1658.

CHAP. I.

The occaſion of this Treatiſe.

THe faireſt eares of Corne are ſooneſt blaſted, ſo the more conſpicuous the Church of England was among the reformed Churches, (as not being framed according to the brainſicke dictates of ſome ſeditious Oratour, or the giddy humours of a tumultuous multitude, but with mature deliberation, and the free conſent and concurrence of all the Orders of the Kingdome,) the more it was ſubjected to the envie and groundleſſ calumnies of our Countrymen of the Roman Communion. But of all the ſlanderous aſperſions caſt upon our Church, that lying fable of the Nagges head Ordination doth beare the bell away. Thoſe monſtrous fictions of the Cretian bulles and minotaures, (deviſed by the Athenians to revenge themſelves upon Minos King of Crete, who had ſubdued them in a juſt warre, and compelled them to ſend their ſons to him for hoſtages,) were not more malicious, nor that shameleſſ lie of *Kentish* long tailes more ridiculous. The firſt deviſer of it doth juſtly deſerve the Character of *A*

man of a braſen forhead and leaden hearte. If the unpartiall reader after he have peruſed this treatiſe, thinke I doe him wrong. I do willingly ſubmitte my ſelf to his cenſure.

This prodigious fable received its deathes wound from Mr. Maſons penne, and hath remained ever ſince for the ſpace of thirty yeares buried in deepe oblivion. And thoſe aſſaies which it maketh now to get wing againe, by the aſſiſtence of two Ignatian Fathers, are but the vaine attempts of a dying Cauſe. Neither would I have troubled the Reader or my ſelf *to bring Owles to Athens*, or to confute a Cauſe which hath bene ſo demonſtratively confuted to my hand, but for two new additions lately ſpread abroad. The one by orall tradition which concerneth my ſelf. That *Father T. and Father B. had ſo confuted the Bishop of Derry in the preſence of the King, that he ſaid he perceived his Father had made me a Lord, but not a Bishop*, And that *afterwards, by my power I had procured thoſe two Ieſuits to be prohibited that preſence. So that whereas Father Talbot uſed to be the Interpreter in the Spanish treaties, now he was not admitted, and Don Iohn would admitte no other.* So

So the Bishop of Derry is accuſed not onely to have bene publickly baffeled, but alſo to have bene a diſturber of publick affaires. Yet I know nothing of all this, which concerneth myſelf. I never heard of any ſuch conference, or any ſuch words, I never knew that Father Talbot was deſigned to that imploiment. I was never guilty of having any ſuch power, muchleſſe of any endevour to turne out any man. If the Fathers ſeemed too pragmaticall to thoſe who were intruſted, or to involue the intereſt of their Religion into Civill treaties, what is that to me? If it were true they may thanke themſelves. If it were falſe, they may thanke them who did it. Whether true or falſe I never had an hand, nor ſo much as a little finger in it.

All the truth that I know is this. Hearing that theſe two Fathers, had ſpoken largely in the Courte of the Succeſſion of our English Biſhops, but never in my preſence, I ſought out Father B, and had private conference with him about it in the Ieſuits College at Bruges, and afterwards ſome diſcourſe with Father T. and him together in mine owne Chamber. Whatſoever they did ſay, they put into writing to which I returned them an anſwer, ſhewing not onely that there

was not, but that it was morally impoſſible there should be any ſuch Ordination at the nagges head. From that day to this I never heard any thing of it, that concerned myſelf. Now if a man should ſearch for an Author of this fabulous Relation, he shall be ſure to have it fathered upon ſome very credible perſõs, without names, who had it from Iohn an okes whileſt he was living, and he had it from Iohn a Stiles, and he had it from No body, but feined it himſelf out of a good intention, according to that caſe Theology which he had learned of Machiavell, *To advance the credit of Religion* by all meanes poſſible true or falſe.

The other addition concerneth the learned and Reverend Biſhop of Dureſme one of the ancienteſt Biſhops this day living in the Chriſtian world, being 95 yeares old at leaſt. That he owned and juſtified the nagges head Ordination in publick Parliament, in the houſe of the Peeres: It is very well, we can not deſire a better place where to have it ſpoken, then the houſe of Parliament. Nor better witneſſes then the Lords ſpirituall and temporall. We have no man of the Epiſcopall Order, whoſe memory can reach ſo neare thoſe times, or in whoſe integrity we doe more confide

conſide, then the Biſhop of Dureſme. He might heare many things either from the perſons prætended to have bene then conſecrated, or from the Notaries or witneſſes who were then preſent at that imaginary Conſecration. Or at leaſt he might receive the tradition of that age from ſuch as were eiewitneſſes of what paſſed. Let it be put to his Teſtimony if they thinke fitte, (without doubt he is the ſame man he was then) or to the Teſtimony of any other of his age and Reputation, whom they can produce. We refuſe no ſort of proofe but onely vaine *bear Jay*, which as our English proverbe ſaith is commonly, and in this caſe moſt undoubtedly a lier. Nay we would not refuſe the Teſtimony of Mr. Neale himſelf, though a profeſſed enemy, who was the onely founder of this ſilly fable, ſo he might be examined upon oath, before equall Iudges, but compell him either to ſhame the divell, and eate his owne words, or to runne himſelf into ſuch palpable abſurdities Contradictions and impoſſibilities, that no man of reaſon how partiall ſoever, could give any credit to him. My firſt taske ſhall be, before I meddle with the fable it ſelf to vindicate the Biſhop of Dureſme, and the truth which is wounded through his ſydes, with this in-

gination to the Reader, that if this branch of the Legend be proved apparently to be falſe, which is pretended to have bene publickly acted in a full houſe of the Peeres of the Realme, we can expect no truth from the voluntary reporte of one ſingle meane malicious enemy, to his own party. And with all a confeſſed Spie, of what was done at the Nagges head. Breake ice in one place, and it will crack in more.

CHAPT. II.

The Vindication of the Bishop of Dureſme.

TO vindicate the Bishop of Dureſme, I shall firſt ſet downe the relation of this paſſage in the words of the Fathers themſelves.

Treatiſe of the name of Catholick faith and hereſy c. 2. p. 9.

In the beginning of the late Parliament ſome Presbiterian Lordes preſented to the upper houſe a certeine booke, proving that the Proteſtant Bishops had no ſucceſſion or conſecration, and therefore were no Bishops and by conſequence had no right to ſitte in Parliament. Hereupon Doctor Morton pretended Bi-

shop

shop of Durrham who is yet alive, made a ſpeech againſt this booke in his owne and all the Bishops behalfe then preſent. He endeavoured to prove ſucceſſion from the laſt Catholick Bishops, who (ſaid he) by impoſition of hands ordeined the firſt Proteſtant Bishops at the Nagges head in Cheap ſyde, as vvas Notorious to all the vvorld. Therefore the afore ſaid booke ought to be looked upon as a groundleſſ libell. This vvas told to many by one of the ancienteſt Peeres of England, præſent in Parliament vvhen Morton made his ſpeech. And the ſame he is ready to depoſe upon his oath. Nay he cannot believe that any vvill be ſo impudent as to denie a thing ſo notorious, vvhereof there are as many vvitneſſes living, as there are Lords and Bishops that vvere that day in the upper houſe of Parliament.

Here are three paſſages. One concerning a booke preſented to the upper houſe, againſt the ſucceſſiō of English Bishops, by ſome preſbiterian Lords.

The

The second concerning the pretended refutation of this booke by the Bishop of Duresme. The third the proofe of both these allegations by the Testimony of an Ancient Peere of England,

First for the booke, It is most true there was a booke written about that time by a single Lord against Episcopacy, and dedicated to the members of both houses of Parliament. No wonder. How often have the Parliaments in the reignes of Queene Elisabeth and King Iames bene troubled with such *Requests* and *Representations*. It is no strange thing that a weake eie should be offended with the light of the sun. We may justly ascribe the reviving of the Aerian heresy in these later daies to the Dispensations of the Courte of Rome who licensed ordinary Priests to ordeine, and confirme, and do the most essentiall offices of Bishops So their Scholes do teach us, *A Preest may be the extraordinary Minister of Priesthood, and inferiour orders by the delegation of the Pope.* Againe *The Pope may conferre the power of confirmation* upon a simple Priest. By such exorbitant practises as these they chalked our the way to Innovators. And yet they are not able to produce one president of such a dispensation throughout the primitive times, A good

Christian

Christian ought to regarde more what the whole Christian world in all ages hath practised, then what a few conceited persons in this last age have fancied. Among all the Easterne Southern and Northerne Christians, who make innumerable multitudes, there neither is nor ever was one formed Church that wanted Bishops. Yet these are as farre from submitting to the exorbitant power of the Roman Bishop as we. Among all the westerne Churches and their Colonies, there never was one formed Church for 1500. yeares, that wanted Bishops. If there be any persons so farre possessed with prejudice, that they chuse rather to follow the private dictates of their owne phrensy, then the perpetuall and universall practise of the Catholick Church, enter not into their secrets o my soule.

Thus farre we agree, but in all the rest of the circumstances, (though they be not much materiall) the Fathers do pitifully mistake themselves, and vary much from the Testimony of their witness, and much more from the truth. First the Authour of this booke was no presbyterian Lord, much lesse a company or caball of Presbiterian Lords in the plurall, but my Lord Brookes, one that had as little favour for

presbytery

Presbytery as for Episcopacy.

Secondly the booke was not præsented to the upper house. It might be brought into the house privately, yet not be præsented to the house publickly. If it had bene publickly præsented, the Clerkes of the Parliament or some of them must needes have known of it and made an Act of it, but they know no such thing. The Lords Spirituall and Temporall could not all have Forgotten it, but they remember no such thing, as by their respective certificates præsently shall appeare.

Thirdly as the Authour is mistaken, and præsentation mistaken. So the subject likewise is mistaken. *Sit liber Iudex*, let the booke speake for it self. Thus an able freind certifieth me. *I have got my Lord Brookes booke which he wrote against the Bishops with much labour, and perused it with no less Patience. And there is not in it the least shadow of any Argument, that the Bishops ought not to sitte in Parliament, because they had no succession or consecration.* What did my Lord Brookes regard succession or Consecration or holy orders, who had a Coachman to be his preacher. The less Canonicall the ordination had bene, the more he would have applauded it. Time and place and forme and all were agreeable to that Christian

ſtian liberty which he dreamed of, it was not wante of conſecratioh, but conſecration it ſelf which he exeepted againſt, as all men knew who knew him. And in this quarrell he loſt his life, after a moſt remarkable and allmoſt miraculous manner, at the ſiege of Lichfield Church, upon St. Ceaddas anniverſary day, who was the founder of that Church and Bishop of it.

I know the Fathers will be troubled much, that this which they have publiſhed to the view of the world, concerning the Bishop of Durrham, as *a truth ſo evident which no man can have the impudence to denie*, should be denied, yea denied poſitively and throughout, denied not onely by the Bishop of Durrham himſelf, bnt by all the Lords ſpirituall and Temporall that can be met with, Denied by ſome Lords of their owne communion, who underſtand them ſelves as well as any among them, though their names are not ſubſcribed, to the certificate, Denied by the Clerkes of the Parliament, whoſe office it is to keepe a diary of all the ſpeeches made in the houſe of the Peeres For Proofe hereof Firſt I produce the Proteſtation of the Bishop of *Dureſme* him ſelf, atteſted by witneſſes in the Præſence of a publick Notary. Take it in his owne words.

Whereas

VVhereas I am most injuriously and slanderously traduced, by a nameles Authour, calling himself N. N. in a booke said to be printed at Rouen 1657 *intituled* [*a treatise of the nature of Catholick faith and heresy*], *as if upon the presenting of a certein booke to the upper house in the beginning of the late Parliament, prouing as he saith the protestant Bishops had no succession nor consecration, and therefore were no Bishops, and by consequence ought not to sit in Parliament, I should make a speech against the said booke in my owne and all the Bishops behalfs, endeuouring to prove succession from the last Catholick Bishops as he there stiles them,) Who by imposition of hands ordeined the first protestant Bishops, at the nagges head in cheapside, as was notorious to all the world, &c.*

I do hereby in the presence of Almighty God solemnely protest and declare to all the world, that what this Authour there affirmes concerning me is a most notorious untruth and a grosse slander. For to the best of my knowledge

and

and remembrance, no such booke as he there mentions was ever presented to the upper house in that or any other Parliament, that ever I sate in. And if there had, I could never have made such a speech as is there pretended, seeing I have ever spokē according to my thoughts, and alwaies believed that fable of the Nagges head consecration to have proceeded from the father of lies; as the Authentick Recordes of the Church still extant, which were so faithfully transcribed, and published by Mr. Mason, do evidently testifie. And whereas the same impudent Libeller doth moreover say, that what he there affirmes was told to many, by one of the ancientest Peeres of England, present in Parliament, when I made this pretended speech: and that he is ready to depose the same upon his oath: And that he can not believe any will be so impudent, to denie a thing so notorious, whereof there are as many witnesses living, as there are Lords and Bishops that were that day in the upper house of Parliament &c. I answer, that

I am very unwilling to beleeve any peere of England should have so little sense of his Conscience and honour, as either to sweare or so much as affirme such a notorious untruth. And therefore for the justification of my self and Manifestation of the truth in this Particular, I do freely and vvillingly appeale (as he directs me) to those many honourable persons, the Lord Spirituall and temporall yet alive, vvho sate in the house of Peeres in that Parliament, or to as many of them as this my Protestation shall come to, for a true certificate of vvhat they knovv or believe Concerning this matter. Humbly desiring them and charging it upon their soules, as they vvill answver it to god at the day of Iudgment, that they vvill be pleased to testifie the truth, and nothing but the truth herein, to the best of their knovvledg and remembrance, vvithout any favour or affection to me at all. I cannot reasonably be suspected by any indifferent man, of denyng any thing that I knovv or believe to be true, seeing I

am

am so shortly in all probability to render an account to the searcher of hearts of all my words and actions, being now (at the least) upon the ninetyfifth yeare of my age. And I acknowledge it a great mercy and favour of God, that he hath reserved me thus long, to cleare the Church of England and my self of this most notorious Slander, before he takes me to himself. For I can not imagine any reason, why this shameless writer might not have cast the same upon any of my Reverend Brethren as well as me, but onely that I being the eldest, it was probable I might be in my graue, before this untruth could be taken notice of in the world. And now I thanke god I can cherefully sing my nunc dimittis, *unless it please him to reserve me for the like service hereafter: for I desire not to live any longer upon earth, then he shall be pleased to make me his instrument to defend the truth, and promote his glory. And for the more solemne and full Confirmation of this my free and voluntary protestation and*

declaration I have hereunto set my hand and seale, this seventeenth day of Iuly. Anno Domini 1658.

THOMAS DVRESME.

Signed sealed published and declared, in the presence of Tho: Sanders Sen:, Tho: Sanders Iun:, Iohn Barwick Clerke, R: Gray, Evan Davies.

I Tobias Holder publick Notary, being requested by the Right Reverend Father in God Thomas Lo. Bishop of Duresme, at the house of Thomas Sanders Esquire, in the Parish of Flamstead, in the County of Hartford, in the yeare of our Lord moneth and day above specified, was then and there personally present, where and vvhen the said Reverend Bishop did Signe publish and declare this his Protestation and declaration above vvriten, to be his Act and deed, and did cause his Authentick Episcopall Seale, to be there to affixed, in the presence of the vvitnesses vvhose names are there to subscribed. And did there

and

and then likevvise signe publish and declare as his Act and deed, another of the same Tenor vvritten in paper, vvhich he Signed vvith his Manuall Seale, in the presence of the same vvitnesses. All this I heard, saw, and therefore knovv to be done. In Testimony vvhereof I have subscribed and thereto put my usuall and accustomed Notaries Signe. TOBIAS HOLDER.

Publick Notary.

How doth this so solemne Protestation agree with the former Relation of the Fathers, that the Bishop of *Durham* affirmed publickly in the upper house that *the first Protestant Bishops were Consecrated in the Nages head*, that *they were not Consecrated at Lambeth*, that *this was notorious to all the world*, that *it is not Credible that any will be so impudent as to denie it*, that *all the rest of the Bishops approved his assertion by their silence, and were glad to have such a retiring place against the Presbyterians*, that *none of the Bishops did give credit to Mr. Masons new found Registers?* Even as light and Darknesse, or truth and falshood, or two Contradictory Propositions do agree together. This is the first witnesse whom any of that party hath adven-

tured to cite publickly and directly for that infamous ſtory whileſt he was living. And they ſee the ſucceſſe of it. I hope they will be wiſer hereafter, then to cite any more living witneſſes.

But it may be that they who do not ſtick to ſuppoſe that our Arch-Biſhops *make falſe certificates*, may object this is but the Teſtimony of the Biſhop of *Durham* in his owne cauſe. Let us ſee whether the other Biſhops diſſent from the Biſhop of *Dureſme*. Take the Teſtimony of them all, who ſate in that Parliament, which are now lining except the Biſhop of *Bangor*, whoſe abſence in *Wales* is the onely reaſon why he is not a ſubſcriber with the reſt.

Whereas we the ſurviving Biſhops of the Church of England, who ſate in the Parliament begun at Weſtminſter the third day of November 1640. *are required by our Reverend Brother the Lord Biſhop of Dureſme, to declare and atteſt the truth, concerning an imputation caſt upon him in the Pamphlet of that nameleſſe Author, mentioned in his Proteſtation and Declaration here prefixed. And whereas we are obliged to performe what he requeſteth, both for the juſtification of the truth, and for the clearing of our ſelves of another ſlanderous aſperſion, which the ſame Author caſteth upon us,*

us, as if we had heard our ſaid Reverend Brother make ſuch a ſpeech as is there pretended, and by our ſilence had approved, what that Libeller falſely affirmeth was delivered in it. We do hereby ſolemnely proteſt and declare before God and all the world, that we never knew of any ſuch booke preſented to the houſe of Peeres, as he there pretendeth, nor believe any ſuch was ever preſented: And therefore could never heare any ſuch ſpeech made againſt it, as he mentioneth, by our ſaid Reverend brother or any other, much leſſe approve of it by our ſilence. And if any ſuch booke had bene preſented, or any ſuch ſpeech had bene made, there is none among us ſo ignorant or negligent of his duty in defending the truth, but would have bene both able and ready to have confuted ſo groundleſſe a fable, as the pretẽded conſecration of Biſhops at the Nagges head, out of the Authentick and knowne regiſters of the Church ſtill extant, mentioned and faithfully trãſcribed and publiſhed by Mr. Maſon ſo long before. For the

confirmation of which truth, and attestation of what our said Reverend Brother hath herewith Protested and declared, we have hereunto set our hands. Dated the 19th. day of July Anno Domini 1658.

LONDON.	BATH. & WELLS.
M. ELI.	JO. ROFFENS.
BR. SARUM.	OXFORD.

If all these proofes seeme not satisfactory to the Fathers, they shall have more. Let them take the Testimony of the Principall Peeres now living, who sate then in Parliament.

VVe of the Lords temporall whose names are here under written, who sate in the Parliament begun at Westminster the third day of November 1640, *being desired by the Bishop of Duresme to testify our knowledge concerning an imputation cast upon him, about a speech pretended to be made by him in that Parliament, more particularly mentioned and disavowed in his prefixed Protestation;*

tion, Doe hereby testify and Declare, that to the best of our present knowledge and remembrance, no such booke against Bishops as is there mentioned, was presented to the house of Peeres in that Parliament. And consequently, that no such speech as is there pretended, was or could be made by him or ony other against it. In testimony whereof we have signed this our attestation with our owne hands. Dated the nineteenth day of July Anno Domini 1658.

DORCHESTER. LINDSEY.
RVTLAND. SOVTHAMTON.
LINCOLNE. DEVONSHIRE.
CLEVELAND. MONMOVTH.
DOVER.

To this proofe nothing remaineth that can be added, but onely the testimony of the Clerke of the Parliament, who after a diligent search made in the booke of the Lords house, hath with his owne hand written this short Certificate, in the margent of one of your bookes pag. 9. over against your relation, *Upon search made in the booke of the Lords house, I do not find any such booke presented, nor any entery of any such speech made by Bishop Morton.*

HENRY SCOBEL CLERK.
Of the Parliament.

And now methinkes I heare the Fathers blaming of their owne credulity, and rashneſſe, and over much confidence. They had forgotten *Epictetus* his rule, *Remember to diſtruſt.* I judge them by my ſelf, *Homo ſum, humani a me nihil alienum puto.* One circumſtance being either latent or miſtaken, may change the whole drift and ſcope of a relation. But though we would be contented to lend a skirt of our coate, to cover the fault of them who calumniate our Church: yet this relation can never be excuſed in any man from a moſt grievous miſtake, where both the perſon, and the whole ſcope of his diſcourſe is altogether miſtaken. This is almoſt as great a miſtake as the Nagges head Ordination it ſelf, where a confirmation dinner was miſtaken for a ſolemne conſecration. But thoſe who cherish ſuch miſtakes for advantage, and deck them up with new matter, and publish them to the world for undoubted truths, cannot be excuſed from formall calumnie.

The laſt thing to be conſidered in this firſt part of this diſcourſe, being the vindication of the Reverend Bishop of *Dureſme*, is concerning the witneſſe, whom as the Fathers do forbeare to name, ſo ſhall I. Of whom they ſay foure things, 1 that *he is one of the Ancienteſt Peeres of England*, that

he

he was preſent in Parliament when Morton *made this ſpeech*, that *he will take his Oath of the truth of it*, and that *he can not believe that any will be ſo impudent to denie it.* We have no diſpute concerning the antiquity of Peerage, Let that paſſe: but I am confidēt whatſoever his preſent judgement had been either of the ſpeaker or of the ſpeech, your witneſs would have abſtained from uncivill language, as to ſtile the Reverend Bishop of Dureſme a *pretended Bishop*, and plaine *Morton*, without either welt or garde He would not have forgotten all his degrees both in the Church and in the Scholes. He will not charge all them with downe right *Impudence*, who tell him that he was doubly miſtaken: Nor call that *notorious to all the world*, which he himſelf acknowledgeth that he never heard of before in his life. He is not guilty of thoſe inferences, and *eo nomine*, which yon have added. I do not beleeve that he doth, or ever did know the Bishop of *Dureſme*, ſo well as to ſweare this is the man: Nor doth take himſelf to be ſo exact an Analyſer of a diſcourſe, as to be able to take his Oath what was the true ſcope of it, *pro* or *contra*; eſpecially whē ſome thing is ſtarted that doth quite divert his attention, as the ſound of the market bell did the Philoſophers Auditours.

This

This is my Charity. And my ground for it is this. When I had once conference with him about this relation, he told me the name of the Naggeshead did surprise him, and he betooke himself to inquire of another what it meant. And when I urged to him, that it was incredible that any Protestant Bishop should make such a speech, unlesse he used it onely by way of Supposition, as *argumentum ad hominem*, a reason fitte for my Lord *Brookes*, that such a Consecration as that was, agreed well enough with his principles, He told me he knew not that, the Bishop might answer so for himself.

To conclude, I have heard the Bishop of *Lincolne* did once mention the Fable of the Nagges head in a speech in Parliament, but with as much Detestation of it, as our Ancestours used to name the Devill. Why might not the mistake both of the person, and of the drift or scope of his speech, be the occasion of this relation? I had rather out of charity run into two such right handed errours, then condemne a Noble Gentleman of whose ingenuity I never had any reason to doubt, of a malicious lie. Take it at the very best, the mistake is great enough, to mistake both the person of the speaker, and the scope of his speech. I hope they will all do that which in Con-

science

ſcience they are obliged to do; that is acquitte the Bishop of *Dureſme*, and crave his pardon for their miſtake. If they do not, the world will acquitte him, and condemne them. But the greateſt miſtake of all others was, to publish ſuch a notorious untruth to the world, ſo temerariouſly without better adviſe.

CHAP. III.

Three reaſons againſt the Nagges head Conſecration, 1. from the Contradictions of the Relaters, 2. from the lateneſſe of the Diſcovery, 3. from the Strictneſſe of our lawes.

NOw having beaten Downe the Pillar about their eares, which they had ſet up to underproppe their Nagges head Ordination, it remaineth next to aſſault the maine fable it ſelf, as it is related by theſe Fathers. Having told, how the Proteſtant Doctors who were deſigned for Biſhopricks in the beginning of Queene Eliſabeths Reigne, *had prevailed with Anthony Kitchin Biſhop of Landaffe, to give them a meeting*

at the Nagged head in Cheape ſyde, in hope he would Ordeine them Bishops there. And how the Bishop of Landaffe *through Bishop Bonners threatenings refuſed*, (all which shall be examined and laid open to the view of the world in due order, how it is ſtuffed with untruth and abſurdities.) They adde, that *being thus deceived of their expectation, and having no other meanes to come to their deſires* (that is, to obteine conſecration), *they reſolved to uſe Mr. Scories helpe, an Apoſtate religious Prieſt, who having borne the name of Bishop in King Edward the ſixths time, vvas thought to have ſufficient povver to performe that Office, eſpecially in ſuch a ſtrait neceſſity as they pretended. He, having caſt of together vvith his Religious habite all ſcruple of conſcience, vvillingly vvent about the matter, vvhich he performed in this ſort. Having the bible in hand, and they all kneeling before him, he laid it upon every one of their heads or shoulders, ſaying, take thou Authority to preach the vvord of God ſincerely. And ſo they roſe up*

Bi;

Bishops of the new Church of England. This narration of the consecration at the Nagges head (they say) they *have taken out of Holywood, Constable, and Dr. Champneys workes.* They might as well have taken it out of Æsops fables, and with as much credit or expectation of truth on our partes.

So the controversy betweene them and us is this. They say that Arch Bishop *Parker* and the rest of the Protestant Bishops, in the beginning of Queene *Elisabeths* reigne, or at the least sundry of them were consecrated at the *Nagges head* in *Cheapeside* together, by Bishop *Scory* alone, or by him and Bishop *Barlow* jointly, without Sermon, without Sacrament, without any solemnity, in the yeare 1559. (but they know not what day, nor before what publick Notaries,) by a new phantastick forme. And all this they say upon the supposed voluntary report of Mr. *Neale* (a single malicious spie,) in private to his owne party, long after the businesse pretended to be done.

We

We ſay Arch Bishop *Parker* was conſecrated alone, at Lambeth, in the Church, by foure Bishops, authoriſed thereunto by Commiſſion under the great Seale of England, with Sermon, with Sacrament, with all due ſolemnities, upon the 17 day of December Anno 1559. before foure of the moſt eniment publick Notaries in England; and particularly by the ſame publick Notary who was Principall Actuary both at Cardinall *Poles* Conſecration and Arch Bishop *Parkers*. And that all the reſt of the Bishops were Conſecrated at other times, ſome in the ſame moneth but not upon the ſame day, ſome in the ſame yeare but not the ſame moneth, and ſome the yeare following. And to prove the truth of our relation and falshood of theirs, we produce the Regiſtet of the See of Canterbury, as authentick as the world hath any, the Regiſters of the other fourteene Sees then vacant, all as carefully kept by ſworne Officers as the Recordes of the Vatican it ſelf. We produce all the Commiſſions under the privy ſeale and great Seale of England: We produce the rolles or Recordes of the Chancery; And if the Recordes of the Signet office had not been unfortunately burned in King *Iames* his time, it might have been verified

rified by those also: We produce an Act of Parliament expres in the pointe, within seven yeares after the Consecration: We produce all the controverted Consecrations published to the world in printe *Anno* 1572. three yeares before Arch Bishop *Parkers* death, whilest all things were fresh in mens memories. These bright beames had bene able to dasell the eies of *Mr. Neale* himself, whilest he was living, and have made him recant his lewd lie, or confes himself starke blinde.

The first reason which I bring against this ridiculous fable, it taken from the palpable Contradictions, and grosse absurdities and defects of those Roman Catholick writers, who have related this filly tale of a tub, and agree in nothing but in their common malice against the Church of England. It is no strange matter for such as write upon heare say, or relie upon the exact truth of other mens notes or memories, to mistake in some inconsiderable circumstance: as to set downe the name of a place amisse, which may be the transcribers faulte, or the printers, as well as the Authours: Or to say two Suffragans for one, when there were two named in the Commission, and but one present at the Consecration. Such immaterial differences *The first reason.*

which

which are so remote from the heart of the Cause, about indifferent Circumstances, may bring the exactnesse of the Relation into question, but not the substantiall truth of it. Such petty unsignificant variations, do rather prove that the Relations were not made upon compact or confederacy. Especially where there are originall Recordes taken upon the place by sworne Notaries, whose names, and hands, and Acts are as well known to every man versed in the Recordes of those times, as a man knoweth his owne house. To which all Relaters and Relations must submitte, and are ready to submitte as to an infallible rule.

But he who should give credit to such a silly senslesse fable as this is, which is wholy composed of absurd, improbable, incoherent, inconsistent, contradictory fictions, had need to have a very implicite faith. The greatest shew of any accord among them is about the Consecrater, yet even in this they disagree one from another. The common opinion is that Bishop *Scory* alone did consecrate them. But Mr. Constable one of their principall authours supposeth, that Bishop *Barlow* might joine with him in the Consecration. And *Sanders*, whose penne in other cases useth to runne over, one who had as much malice

malice as any of them, and had reason to know the passages of those times better then all of them, leaveth it doubtfull, when, or where, or by whom they were ordeined, *quomodocunque facti sunt isti Pseudo-Episcopi; by what meanes soever they were ordeined.*

But they disagree much more among themselves, who they should be that were ordeined. First *Mr. Waddesworth* (whose ingenuity deserveth to be commended) doth not say that any of our Bishops were actually consecrated there, but onely that *there was an attempt to consecrate the First of them*, that was Arch-Bishop *Parker*. But that which destoyeth the credit of this attempt is this, that it is evident by the Recordes, that Arch-Bishop *Parker* was not personally present at his Confirmation in *Bowes* Church, or at his Confirmation dinner at the *Nagges head*, which gave the occasion to this merry Legend: but was confirmed by his Proctor *Nicholas Bullingham* Doctor in the Lawes, upon the ninth of December Anno 1559. A man may be confirmed by Proxie, but no man can be

ordeined by proxie. It is a ruled case in their owne law, *Non licet Sacramentum aliquod præter matrimonium absenti administrare.* So if there was an attempt to consecrate any man at the *Nagges head*, it must be Doctor *Bullingham*, it could not be Arch Bishop *Parker*.

Others say there was more then an attempt, that one or more of them were actually ordeined there: but they name none. Others name some, but they accorde not one with another in naming of them. Some say, *Iewell, Sands, Horn, Grindall*; where was Arch Bishop *Parker*? Others say, *Parker, Grindall, Horne, Sands*. Lastly others say, they were all ordeined there, who were named to Bishopricks, and number fifteen of them. These fathers speake indefinitely, *Parker and his fellowes*. But they seeme to extend this word *fellowes* as farre as Doctor *Champneys* fifteene: for they tell us, that they *all kneeled downe before him*, and *he laid the Bible upon every one of their heads or shoulders*. Thus these *Cadmean* brethren, like those false witnesses which testified against Christ, destroy one another with their mutuall Contradictions.

Thirdly

Thirdly, the time is a principall Circumstance in all Consecrations, and is evermore most punctually recorded by the Actuaries, or publick Notaries. But in this fabulous Relation the time is concealed. It seemeth the Forger was no good Actuary, and either did not know how materiall that Circumstance was, or had forgotten it. Onely Doctor *Champney* telleth us, that it was before the ninth of September Anno 1559. But this is not precise enough for an Act: and moreover, it is most apparently false and impossible. For whereas there are two Commissions under the greate Seale of *England*, for the Confirmation and Consecration of Arch Bishop *Parker*, both recorded in the Rolles; the one which was not executed, dated the said very ninth day of September; and the other which was executed, dated the sixth day of December following: if Doctor Champney said true, Arch Bishop *Parker* was consecrated before he was confirmed, yea before there was any Commission out, either for his Consecration or Confirmation; which is one of the drowsiest dreames that could droppe from an English penne.

Lastly, every Consecration must be performed before one or more publick Notaries. (We shall shew them Notaries enough of great eminence, beyond all exception, for Arch-Bishop *Parkers* true Consecration.) And indeed what could a Consecration availe any man, without a publick Notary to Recorde it, to make an authentick Certificate of it under the seale of the principall Consecrater? Now who recorded the *Nagges head* Consecration? who drew it up into Acts? Who certified it? No body, because the silly forger did not understand what things were requisite to a Consecration. Onely as the *Athenians* sometimes said of *Metiochus*, *Metiochus grindes the corne*, *Metiochus bakes the bread*, *Metiochus mendes the highwaies*, *Metiochus doth all, an evill yeare to Metiochus*: So we may say of Mr. *Neale*; Mr. *Neale* was the spie, Mr. *Neale* was the witness, Mr. *Neale* was the publick Notary, Mr. *Neale* was the chiefe Eugenier or forger, Mr. *Neale was* all, what honours are due to Mr. *Neale*?

Qui tot sustinuit, qui tanta negotia solus.

So they feine a Consecration without a publick Notary, or (which is all one) no man

man ever knew who that publick Notary was; At a time impossible, or els no man knoweth at what time; without any certeinty who consecrated, whether *Scory* alone, or *Scory* and *Barlow* together, or God knoweth who; and yet with much lesse certeinty who were consecrated, whether none at all, but onely an attempt was made, or one, and who that one was; or some indefinitely, without naming who they were, or how many they were; or foure expressly, but dissenting one from another who those foure were. Here is a story composed altogether of uncerteinties and contradictions, like *A man and no man, hit a bird and no bird, on a tree and no tree, with a stone and no stone.* To make this uncerteine, groundless, contradictory rumour, to be the touchstone of truth, and to overballance all the authentick Recordes of the Kingdome, in a matter of such publick concernment: is just to make the Parish clock goe truer then the Sun, because the Clerke who settes it is our Freind.

My second reason against this senselefs fable, is the late discovery of it to the world, and the long concealing of it in holes and corners before they durst adventure present it to the view of the world, *Seeond reason.*

Can any man who is in his right wittes be so stupide as to imagine, that the *Nagges head* Ordination happened in the yeare 1559, and (if these Fathers say truely) was *notoriously knowne to all the world*; and that it should never once Peepe into the light for almost a whole age after it was pretended to have been done, that is till after the yeare sixteen hundred? We use to say a monster is but nine daies wonder: but this ugly monster was not taken notice of in the world untill after forty yeares. The reason is evident; Either it was then but newly hatched, or it had bene kept all that time at dry nurse in a closet. If it had bene so *notorious to all the world* from the yeare 1559 as the fathers feine, all the windowes in the *Nagges head* would have been full of it, and the roome would have been shewed to all their guests, where such a prodigious pageant had bene acted.

I dare appeale to the judgments of these Fathers themselves, whether it be Credible, that this story should be notoriously knowne to the world in the beginning of Queene *Elisabeths* reigne, and yet neither *Stapleton*, nor *Harding*, nor *Bristow*, nor *Alan*, nor *Reynoldes*, nor *Parsons*, nor any one of all their Roman Catholick writers, should so

ſo much as mention it for forty yeares enſuing; eſpecially writing ſo much as they did upon that very ſubject, the validity or invalidity of our Ordination. How could their ſilence have bene excuſed from betraying of their cauſe, to loſe ſuch an egregious advantage? Was it peradventure out of affection to us, to conceale the Defects of the Proteſtãts? No, they had will enough, but they durſt not avouch ſuch a Monſtrous untruth in earneſt, (if ever they did heare of ſuch a vain rumour, which I can not eaſily beleeve,) ſo contrary to the knowledg of tha t age.

Eſpecially let them tell me how it commeth to paſſe, that Nicolas *Sanders*, who profeſſeth to write *the Eccleſiaſticall hiſtory of England, from the one and twentieth yeare of Henry the eighth*, untill the Eight and *twentieth yeare of Queene* Eliſabeth then current, in his three bookes of the *Originall and progreſſe of the English Schiſme*, hath not one ſyllable of the *Nagges head* Ordination? He was never accuſed of partiality for the Proteſtants, (but as malicious againſt the Proteſtants as any man could wish): nor of concealing truths to their advantage, but of Deviſing fables to their prejudice.

He having related the forme of our English Consecrations, partly true and partly false, proceedth to this first Ordination of Protestant Bishops, in the beginning of Queen *Elisabeths* Reigne; alleging that *the Catholick Bishops refused to impose hands upon them*, And that *they had not of themselves two or three Bishops, or so much as one Metropolitan.* What a shameless untruth is this, that there were not two or three Protestant Bishops, when the Queenes Commission under the great Seale of *England*, recorded in the Rolles, is directed to seven Protestant Bishops, expresly by their names and titles?

De Schism. Angl. c. 3. p. 400. Edit Rom.

He addeth, that *they were very instant with an Irish Arch Bishop to have presided at their Ordination, but he would not.* He mistaketh the matter altogether, They might have had seven Irish Arch Bishops and Bishops if they had needed them; where the procedings were not so rigorous, where the old Bishops complied and held their places, and joined in such Ecclesiasticall Acts, untill they had made away to their kindred, all the lands belonging to their Sees. We found one Bishoprick reduced to five

five markes a yeare by theſe tempo-riſers, another to forty shillings a yeare, and all of them to very poore pittances for Prelates. But by this meanes there wanted no Ordeiners. Never did any man queſtion the Ordination of the firſt Proteſtant Bishops in *Ireland* untill this day.

Then he telleth, how being thus rejected by the Catholick Bishops and the Irish Arch Bishop, they applied themſelves *to the lay Magiſtrate in the enſuing Parliament for a confirmation, from whence they were called Parliamentary Bishops.* By whom were they called ſo? By no man but himſelf and his fellowes. How many Ordinations were paſſed over, one after another, before that Parliament? Was there any thing moved in this Parliament, concerning any the leaſt eſſentiall of our Epiſcopall Ordination? Not at all, but onely concerning the repealing and reviving of an English Statute. English Statutes can not change the eſſentialls of Ordination, either to make that Conſecration valid which was invalid, or that invalid which was valid. The validity or invalidity of Ordination, depen-

deth

deth not upon humane law, but upon the institution of Christ. Neither did we ever since that Parliament change one syllable in our forme of Ordination. Then what was this Confirmation which he speakes of? It was onely a Declaration of the Parliament, that all the Objections which these men made against our Ordinations, were slanders and calumnies: and that all the Bishops which had been ordeined in the Queenes time, had bene rightly ordeined, according to the forme prescribed by the Church of England, and the Lawes of the Land. These men want no confidence, who are not ashamed to cite this Statute in this case. But we shall meete with this Parliament againe.

In all this impertinent Discourse, where is the fable of the *Nagges head* Ordination? It had bene a thousand times more materiall then all this *Iargon*. And you may be sure it had not been missing, if there had bene the least graine of truth in it, or if there had but been any suspicion of it when that was written. It was not then full thirty yeares after Arch-Bishop *Parker's* Consecration, and there were store of eye-witnesses living to have hissed such a senselesse fable out of the world, And therefore

* *Sander.*

Sanders very prudently for himself, after so many intimations, passeth by their Ordination in a deepe silence, which was the onely worke he tooke in hand to shew. *Qualescunque fuerint aut quomodocunque facti sint isti Pseudo-Episcopi &c. What manner of persons soever these False-Bishops were, or after what manner soever they were ordeined &c.* If Bishop *Scory* had ordeined them all at the *Naggeshead*, by layng a Bible upon their heads, and this forme of wordes, *Take thou Authority to preach the word of god Sincerely, M. Sãders* needed not to have left the case so doubtfull, how they were ordeined. And if there had bene the least suspicion of it, he would have blowen it abroad upon a silver Trumpet: but God be thanked there was none. The universall silence of all the Romish writers of that age, when the *Naggeshead* Ordination is pretended to have been done, in a case which concerned them all so nearely, and which was the Chiefe subject of all their disputes; is a convincing proofe to all men who are not altogether possessed with prejudice, that either

either it was deviſed long after, or was ſo lewde a lie, that no man dared to owne it, whileſt thouſands of eyewitneſſes of Arch Bishop *Parkers* true Conſecration at *Lambeth* were living.

The third Reaſon.

A third reaſon, againſt this ridiculous libell of the *Nagges head* Conſecration, is taken from the ſtrictneſſ of our lawes, which allow no man to conſecrate or be conſecrated but in a ſacred place, with due matter and forme, and all the Rites and Ceremonies preſcribed by the Church of *England*. No man muſt be Conſecrated by fewer then foure Bishops, or three at leaſt, And that after the Election of the Deane and Chapiter is duely confirmed, And upon the mandate of Commiſſion of the King under the great ſeale of *England*; under the paine of a *Premunire*, that is, the forfeiture of lands and goods, and livings, and liberty, and protection. They allow not Conſecration in a Taverne, without due matter and forme, without the Ceremonies and ſolemnity preſcribed by the Church, without Election, without Confirmation, without letters Patents, by one ſingle Bishop, or two at the moſt; ſuch as they feine

25. *H.* 8. *c.* 20.

feine the *Nagges head* Ordination to have been. Who can beleeve, that two Arch-Bishops and thirteen Bishoppes, having the reputation of learning and prudence, should wilfully thrust themselves into an apparent Premunire, to forfeite not onely their Arch Bishopricks and Bishopricks, but all their estates and all their hopes, for a phantastick forme, and scandalous Consecration: when the Queene and Kingdome were favorable to them, when the forme prescribed by the Church did please them well enough, when there were protestant Bishops of their owne Communion enough to Consecrate them, when all the Churches in the Kingdome were open to them; unlesse it had been Midsummer moone in December: and they were all starke mad, and then it is no matter where they were consecrated?

In criminall causes, where things are pretended to be done against penall lawes, such as this is, the proofes ought to be clearer then the noone day light. Here is nothing proved, but one single witnesse named and he a professed enemy, who never testified it upon Oath, or before a Iudge, or so much

much as a publick Notary, or to the face of a proteſtant, but onely whiſpered it in corners (as it is ſaid by Adverſaries) among ſome of his owne party. Such a teſtimony is not worth a deafe nut, in any cauſe betweene party and party. If he had bene a witneſse beyond all exception, and had beē duly ſworne and legally examined, yet his teſtimony in the moſt favourable cauſe had been but halfe a proofe, though an hundred did teſtifie it from his mouth, it is ſtill but a ſingle teſtimony: And as it is, it is plaine prittle prattle, and ought to be valued no more then the ſhadow of an aſſe. To admit ſuch a teſtimony, or an hundred ſuch teſtimonies, againſt the publick authentick Recordes of the Kingdome, were to make our ſelves guilty of more madneſs, then they accuſe the Biſhops of. If *St. Paul* forbid *Timothy* to receive an accuſation againſt a ſingle Presbyter under two or three witneſſes, he would not have us to condemne fifteen Biſhops of ſuch a penall crime, upon a ridiculous rumour contrary both to the lawes and Records of the Kingdome. The ſeverity of our lawes doth deſtroy the credit of this fable.

CHA

CHAP. III.

The fourth and fifth reasons against this improbable fiction, from the no necessity of it, and the lesse advantage of it.

MY fourth plea is, because there was no need to play this counterfeit pageant. We use to say Necessity hath no law, that is, regardeth no law. In time of warre the lawes are silent, but this was a time of peace. First there could be no necessity why they should have a clandestine Consecration, without a Register or publick Notary, when they might have had an Army of publick Notaries ready upon their whistle, evē under their elbowes at *Bowes* Church, out of the Courtes of the *Arches*, and the *Audience*, and *Prerogative*. Secondly, there was no necessity why they should anticipate the Queenes *Letters patents* for their consecration, by whose gracious favour they were elected, and of the accomplishmēt whereof in due time they could not doubt; unlesse they would wilfully destroy their owne hopes, by such a mad pranke as this had been, that is, unlesse they would themelves

selves hew downe the bough where upon they stood. Thirdly, there was no necessity that they should chuse a common Taverne for the place of their Consecration, when the Keies of all the Churches in the Kingdome were at their Command. Fourthly, there could be no necessity why they should deserte the forme of Ordination prescribed by the Law, which was agreeable both to their judgements, and to their desires, and to their duties; and to omitte the essentialls of Ordination, both matter and forme, which they knew well enough, to be consecrated after a new brainsick manner.

Then all the necessity which can be pretended, is want of a competent number of Ordeiners. Suppose there had bene such a necessity to be ordeined by two Bishops, or by one Bishop, this very necessity had bene a sufficient Dispensation with the rigour of the Canons, and had instified the Act. as *St. Gregory* pleadeth to *Augustine*.

Resp. Int. 8. August. *In the English Church wherein there is no other Bishop but thy self, thou canst not ordeine a Bishop otherwise then alone.*

And after this manner our First English Bishops were ordeined. And so might these

these protestant Bishops have bene validely ordeined, if they received the essentialls of Ordination. But what a remedy is this, because they could not have a competent number of Bishops, according to the canons of the Church, and the lawes of England, therefore to reject the essentialls of Ordination, for a defect which was not essentiall, and to cast of obedience to their superiours, both civill ād Ecclesiasticall? This had bene just like little children which because they cā not have some toy which they desire, cast away their garments, and whatsoever their Parēts had provided for them. Wante of three Bishops might in some cases make a consecration illegall or uncanonicall, but it could not have rendered it invalide, as this silly pretēded Ordinatiō had.

But now I come up close to the ground worke of the fable, and I denie positively that there was any such want of a competent number of Bishops, as they pretend. And for proofe hereof, I bring no vaine rumours or uncertein conjectures, but the evident and authentick testimony of the great seale of England, affixed to the Queenes *Letters Patents*, for authorising the Confirmation and Consecration of Arch-Bishop *Parker*, dated the sixth day of *December*, Anno 1559. dire-

Rot. 14 Pars 2. Elisab.

 cted

&ted to seven protestant Bishops, namely *Anthony* Bishop of *Landaffe*, *William Barlow* sometimes Bishop of *Bath* and *Welles*, and then elect Bishop of *Chicheſter*, *John Scory* sometimes Bishop of *Chicheſter*, then Elect Bishop of *Hereforde*, *Miles Coverdale* sometimes Bishop of *Exceter*, *John* Suffragan Bishop of *Bedford*, *John* Suffragan Bishop of *Thetford*, and *John Bale* Bishop of *Oſſory* in *Ireland*. Three are a Canonicall number, if there were choiſe of seven, then there was no wante of a competent number to ordeine canonically. I adde, that if it had bene needfull, they might have had seven more out of *Ireland*, Arch Bishops and Bishops, for such a worke as a conſecration. *Ireland* never wanted ſtore of Ordeiners. Not ever yet did any man object, want of a Competent number of Conſecraters, to an Irish Proteſtant Bishop. They who concurred freely in the Conſecration of Proteſtant Bishops at home, would not have denied their concurrence in England, if they had been commanded. Which makes me give no credit to that vaine reporte of an Irish Arch Bishop priſoner in the tower, who refuſed to complie with the deſires of the proteſtant Bishops, *for his liberty and a large reward*. But the Arch

Bishop

Bishop wanteth a name, and the Fable wanteth a ground; the witnesses and persuaders are all unkowne. And if there had bene a grane of truth in this relation; yet in this case one man is no man, one mans refusall signifieth nothing.

Against the evident truth of this assertion, two things may be opposed out of the relation of these Fathers. The First is particular, concerning the Bishop of Landaffe, that he was no Protestant, but a Roman Catholick untill his death. So they say indeed, that *he was the onely man of all the Catholick Bishops, that tooke the oath of Supremacy.* Observe how prejudice and partiality doth blindfold men of learning and partes; They confess he tooke the oath of supremacy, and yet esteeme him a good Roman Catholick. I see censures go by favour, and one may Steale an horse, better then another looke over the hedge. I am well contented, that they reckon him for so good a Catholick.

They adde, that *he knew* Parker *and the rest which were to be ordered Bishops to be hereticks, and averse from the Doctrine of the Roman Catholick Church, which he Constantly adhered unto, (the Supremacy onely excepted)*

during his life. And a little after they tell us, that *he desired to be numbred among Catholicks.* Now what if the Bishop of Landaff after all this should prove to be a protestãt? Then all the Fathers story is quite spoiled. And so he was. If he knew *Parker* and the rest, to be heretickes, he knew himself to be one of their brother hereticks. His daily masse was the English Leiturgy, as well as theirs, He adhered constantly to a Protestant Bishoprick during his life, as well as any of them, And if he did not hold it as long as any of them, it was deaths fault, and none of his fault.

They say *they prevailed with him to give them a meeting at the Nagges head in Cheapeside, where they hoped he would ordeine them Bishops, despairing that ever he would do it in a Church, because that would be too great and notorious a scandall for Catholicks.* They were too modest. They might easily have prevailed with him, or have had him commanded to joine in their consecration in a Church, after a legall manner. He who did not stick at renouncing the Pope, and swearing an oath of Supremacy to his Prince, would not have stucke at a legall Ordination, upon the just command of his

his Prince. But to desire him to do it in a taverne, in a clandestine manner, without the authority of the greate seale, before their election was confirmed, was to desire him out of Curtesy to run into a Premunire, that is to forfeit his Bishoprick of Landaffe, his estate, his liberty. Is it become a more notorious scandall to Catholicks, to ordeine in a Church, then in a taverne, in the judgment of these fathers? There may be scandall taken at the former, but notorious scandall is given by the later.

Here Bishop *Bonner* steppeth upon the stage, and had wellneare prevented the whole pageant, by sending his *Chaplein to the Bishop of Landaffe, to forbid him under paine of excommunication to exercise any such power of giving Orders in his dioceffe, where with the old man being terrified, and other wise moved in conscience refused to proceed.* Bishop *Bonner* was allwaies very fierce which way soever he went: If *Acworth* say true, he escaped once very narrowly in *Rome*, either burning or boiling in scalding leade, for being so violent before the Assembly of Cardinalls, against the Pope, on the behalf of *Henry* the eight, if he had not secured himself by flight. Afterwards he made such bonefires of protestants, and

Acworth cont. monar. Sander. l. 6. p. 195.

and rendered himself so odious, that his prison was his onely safeguard from being torne in pieces by the People. But that was, *dum stetit Iliam & ingens Gloria Teucrorum*, whilest he had his Prince to be his second. Now he was deprived, and had no more to doe with the Bishoprick of London, then with the Bishoprick of *Constantinople*, he had the habituall power of the Keies, but he had no flock to exercise it upon. If he had continued Bishop of *London* still, what hath the Bishop of *London* to do with the Bishop of *Landaffe*? *Par in parem non habet potestatem.* Thirdly, Bowes Church which is neare the *Naggeshead*, wherein the Ecclesiasticall parte of this story, so farre as it hath any truth in it, was really acted, (that is the Confirmation of Arch Bishop Parkers election) though it be in the City of London, as many Churches more, is not in the Diocesse of London, but a Peculiar under the Iurisdiction of the Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*.

Lastly, the Fathers say that *when Parker and the rest see that he had refused, they reviled the poore old man, calling him doating foole, and some of them saying, This old foole thinketh that we can not be Bishops, unlesse we*

be greaſed. The contrary is evident by the Recordes of the confirmation, that Arch Bishop *Parker* was not preſent in perſon: So this whole narration is compoſed of untruthes, and miſtakes, and incongruities, and contradictions. But that which diſcovereth the falſity of it apparently to all the world is this, that the Bishop of Landaff lived and died a proteſtant Bishop, in the reigne of Queene Eliſabeth, as he had bene formerly in the reigne of King Edward, for proofe whereof I produce two of their owne Authours. The one is Sanders, *But the Bishops, who had bene created out of the Church in thoſe moſt wicked times, who had now repented from their hearts of their Schiſme, being not contented with this common diſpenſation and confirmation, did each of them particularly crave pardon of their former grievous fault from the See Apoſtolick, and Confirmation in their Bishopricks, excepting the Bishop of Landaffe, who omitting it rather out of negligence then malice, did onely relapſe into Schiſme in the reigne of Queene Eliſabeth, as we interprete it by the juſt judgement of god.* He acknowledgeth, that he became a Proteſtant againe, that is in their language, *relapſed into Schiſme.* The other is cited by Doctor Harding, *We had onely one foole*

Sand. de Schiſm. l. 2. p. 350

Confut. Apol. parte 6. c. 2.

among us, (we see whose livery the foole was,) *who now I know not by what entisements is become yours, being unworthy the name of a Lord and a Bishop, whose learning is very little, and his credit by this action much lost.* Thus writeth Doctor *Harding* of the Bishop of *Landaffe*, about the fifth yeare of Queene *Elisabeth*, at which time he was living, and continued protestant Bishop of *Landaff*.

A second objection against the truth of that which hath bene said of the competent Number of our Protestant Bishops to make a canonicall Ordination, is an exception against all the seven Bishops named in the letters Patents, that they were no true Bishops, because all of them were ordeined in a time of Schisme, and two of them in King *Edwards* time, according to a new forme of Ordination, and consequently they could not ordeine. *That Ordination which was instituted by Edward the sixth was judged invalide by the Catholicks, and so declared by publick judgment in Queene Maries reigne, in so much as leases made by King Edward*

Brookes Novel, Cases placit. 493.

wards Bishops, though confirmed by Deane and Chapiter were not esteemed available, because they were not (saith the sentence) consecrated, nor Bishops.

To the First part of this objection, that our consecraters were ordeined themselves by Schismaticks or in a time of Schisme, I answer three waies. First this argument is a meere begging of the quæstion. The case in briefe is this. If those branches of Papall power which we cast out of *England* by our Lawes at the Reformation, were plaine usurpations, then our Reformation is but a reinfanchisement of our selves, and the Schisme lieth at their dore, then they may question the validity of their owne Ordination upon this ground, not ours: But we are ready to mainteine to all the world that all those branches of Papall power, which we cast out by our lawes at the Reformation, were grosse usurpations, first introduced into England above eleven hundred yeares after Christ. So this part of the Objection concerneth them not us.

Secondly these Fathers know wel enough, and can not but acknowledg, that accor-

ding to the principles of the Catholick Church and their owne practise, the Ordination not onely of Schismaticks, but of hereticks, if it have no essentiall defect is valide, and the persons so Ordeined ought not to be reordeined, but onely reconciled. Many Orthodox Chriſtians had their holy orders from hereticall Arrians. If *Cranmer*, and Latimer, and Barlow, and *Hodkins*, were no true Bishops, becauſe they were ordeined in a time of Schisme then *Gardinar*, and *Bonner*, and *Tunſtall*, and *Thurleby*, &c. were no true Bishops, for they were ordeined in a time of Schisme likewise; then Cardinall *Pole* and *Bishop Watſon*, and *Chriſtopherſon* and all reſt of their *Bishops* were no true *Bishops* who were ordeined by theſe. So to put out one of our eies (like the envious man in the fable) they would put out both their owne.

Thirdly I anſwer, that it was not we who made a Diſcrimination betweene our Bishops and their Bishops, as to the power of Ordination, but the Marian *Bishops* themſelves, who made a mutuall covenant, *one and all*, that none of them ſhould impoſe hands upon any new elected Bishops; thinking vainely, there could

other Conſecraters have bene found out, and that by this meanes they should both preſerve their Bishopricks, and bring the Queene to their bent: but they found themſelves miſerably deceived. Many Bishops who had bene chaſed out of their Bishopricks in Queene Maries daies, did now returne from exile, and ſupplie the place of Conſecraters. Then *conjurationis eos penituit, The Bishops repented of their Conſpiracy.* Multi ad judices recurrunt, &c. *many of them ran to the Iudges, confeſſed their obſtinacy, and deſired leave to take the oath of Supremacy.* Thus writeth *Acworth* an Author of good account in, thoſe daies. If this foolish conſpiracy had not bene. we had had no Difference about our Conſecrations.

Acworth. cont. Sander. l.2. pag. 197.

To the ſecond part of this objection, that the forme of Ordeining uſed in King Edwards daies, was declared invalide in Queene Maries Daies, I anſwer, Firſt, that we have no reaſon to regarde the Iudgment of their Iudges in Queene Maries Dayes, more then they regard the judgment of our Iudges in Queene Eliſabeths daies. They who made no ſcruple to take away their lifes, would make no ſcruple to take away their holy Orders.

Se-

Secondly I answer that which *the Fathers* call a *sentence*, was no sentence. The word is *Dicitur*, *it is said* or *it is reported*, not *decretum est*, *it is decreed*. Neither were Queene Maries lawes proper rules, nor Queene Maryes Iudges at common law the proper Iudges, of the validity of an Episcopall consecration, or what are the essentialls of ordination, according to the institution of Christ. They have neither rules, nor grounds for this in the common law.

Thirdly I answer that the question in Queene Maries daies was not about the validity or invalidity of our Orders, but about the legality or illegality of them, not whether they were conformable to the institution of Christ, but whether they were conformable to the Lawes of England.

The Lawes of England can neither make a valide ordination to be invalide, nor an invalide ordination to be valide, becaus they can not change the institution of Christ. In summe King Edwards Bishops were both validely ordeined according to the institution of Christ, and legally ordeined according to the lawes of Englād. But Queene Mary changed the Law, that the

form

forme of ordeining which had beē allowed in King Edwards daies should not be allowed in her daies. Notwithstanding Queene *Maries* law, they continued still true Bishops, by the institution of Christ, But they were not for that time legall Bishops in the eie of the Law of *England*, which is the Iudges rule. But when Queene *Elisabeth* restored King *Edwards* law, then they were not onely true valide Bishops, but legall Bishops againe.

That corollary which the fathers adde, *in so much as leases made by King* Edwards *Bishops though confirmed by the Deane and Chapter were not esteemed available, because they were not consecrated or Bishops*, that is in the eie of the English law at that time, signifieth nothing at all. Leases concerne the *benefice* of a Bishop, not the *Office* of a Bishop. A Bishop who is legally ordeined, though he be invalidely ordeined, may make a lease which is good in law. And a Bishop which is validely ordeined, if he be illegally ordeined, may make a lease which is voide in law.

Concerning Bishop *Bonners Conscience*, that he lost his Bishoprick for his conscience, and therefore it is not probable that *he would make himself guilty of so much*

much sacrilege, as to declare King Edwards forme of ordination to be invalide for the profit of new Leases, it belongeth not to me to judge of other mens Consciences. But for Bishop *Bonners* Consience I referre him to the Testimony of one of his Freinds, *Nicolas Sanders*, who speaking of Bishop Gardiner, Bishop Bonner, Bishop Tunstall and the Bishops of Worcester and Chichester, concludeth with these words. *Tamen ergo restiterunt pueri Regis primatui spirituali, imo simpliciter subscripserunt & in omnes cæteras innovationes, quæ non videbantur ipsis continere apertam hæresim, ne Episcopatus & honores perderent, vel ultro, vel contra conscientiam coacti consenserunt.* Therefore they resisted the spirituall primacy of the King being but a boy faintly, yea they subscribed to it simply, and they consented to all the rest of the innovations, which did not seeme to them to conteine manifest heresy either of their owne accord, or compelled against Conscience, least they should lose their Bishopricks and honours. We see they had no great reason to bragge of Bishop Bonners Conscience, who sometimes had bene a great favorite of Cranmer and Crumwell. He got his Bishoprick by opposing the Pope, and lost his Bishoprick by opposing his Prince

De Schismate l. 2. p. 282 Edit. Rom.

But if reordination be such a sacrilege, many Romanists are guilty of grosse sacrilege, who reordeine those Proselites whom they seduce from us, with the same essentialls, matter and forme, imposition of hands, and these words *Receive the holy Ghost*; wherewith they had been formerly ordeined by us.

Lastly I answer, (and this answer alone is sufficient to determine this controversy,) that King Edwards forme of ordination was judged valide in Queene Maries daies by all Catholicks, and particularly by Cardinall *Pole* then Apostolicall Legate in England, and by the then Pope *Paul* the fourth, and by all the clergy and Parliament of England. The case was this. In the Act for repealing all statutes made against the see of Rome, in the first and second yeares of Philip and Mary, the Lords Spirituall and Temporall in Parliament assembled, representing the whole body of the Realme of England, presented their common request to the King and Queene, that they would be a meanes to the Legate to obteine some settlements by authority of the Popes Holiness, for peace sake, in some Articles where of this is one. *That institutiõs of Benefices and other Promotions*

Eccle-

Eccleſiaſticall, and Diſpenſations made according to the forme of the Act of Parliament might be confirmed. Inſtitutions could not be confirmed, except Ordinations were confirmed. For the greateſt part of the English Clergy had received both their benefices and their holy orders, after the caſting out of the Popes uſurped authority out of *England*. And both benefices and holy orders are comprehended under the name of Eccleſiaſticall Promotions. This will appeare much more clearely by the very words of the Cardinalls Diſpenſation, *Ac omnes eccleſiaſticas ſeculares ſeu quorumvis ordinum regulares perſonas, quæ aliquas impetrationes, diſpenſationes, conceſſiones, gratias & indulta, tam ordines quam beneficia Eccleſiaſtica, ſeu alias ſpirituales materias, pretenſa authoritate ſupremitatis Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ, licet nulliter & de facto obtenuerint, & ad cor reverſæ Eccleſiæ unitati reſtituta fuerint, in ſuis Ordinibus & beneficiis, per nosipſos ſeu a nobis ad id deputatos miſericorditer recipiemus, prout jam multæ receptæ fuerunt, ſecumque ſuper his opportune in domino diſpenſabimus.*

And

And we vvill graciously receive (or interteine) *by our selves or by others deputed by us to that purpose, (as many have already beeen receiued) in their Orders and in their Benifices, all Ecclesiasticall Persons as well Secular as Regular of whatsoever Orders, vvhich have obteined any suites, dispensations, grants, graces, and indulgences, as vvell in their Ecclesiasticall Orders, as Benefices and other spirituall matters, by the pretended authority of the Supremacy of the Church of England, though ineffectually and onely* de facto, *so they be penitent, and be returned to the unity of the Church. And vve vvill in due season dispense vvith them in the Lord for these things.*

Cardinall Poles Dispensation.

Here we see evidently, that upon the request of the Lords Spirituall and Temporall and Commons, being the representative body of the Church and Kingdome of England, by the intercession of the King and Queene, the Popes Legate did receive all persons, which had been Ordeined or Beneficed, either in the time of King *Henry* or *King Edward*, in their respective Orders

and Benefices, which they were actually poſſeſſed of, at the time of the making of this diſpenſation or Confirmation, without any exception or Condition, but onely this, that they were returned to the unity of the Catholick Church. Neither was there ever any one of them who were then returned, either deprived of their Benefices, or compelled to be reordeined. From whence I argue thus, Either King *Henry* the eighths Bishops and Prieſts, and likewiſe the Bishops and Prieſts Ordeined in *King Edward* the ſixths time, had all the Eſſentialls of Epiſcopall and Prieſtly Ordination, which were required by the inſtitution of Chriſt; and then they ought not to be reordeined, Then (in the judgement of theſe Fathers themſelves) it is grievous ſacrilege to reordeine them: Or they wanted ſome eſſentiall of their reſpective Ordinations, which was required by the inſtitution of Chriſt; and then it was not in the power of all the Popes and Legates that ever were in the world, to confirme their reſpective Orders, or diſpenſe with them to execute their functions in the Church. But the Legate did Diſpenſe with them to hold their Orders, and exerciſe their ſeverall functions in the Church, and the Pope

did

did confirme that dispensation. This doth clearely destroy all the pretensions of the Romanists against the validity of our *Orders*.

It may perhaps be objected, that the dispensative word is *recipiemus*, *we will receive*, not we do receive. I answer, the case is all one; If it were unlawfull to receive them in the present, it was as unlawfull to receive thē in the future. All that was done after, was to take a particular absolutio on or confirmation from the Pope or his Legate, which many of the Principall Clergy did, but not all; No not all the Bishops, Not the Bishop of *Landaff*, as *Sanders* witnesseth, Yet he injoied his Bishoprick, So did all the rest if the Clergy, who never had any particular confirmation. It is not materiall at all, whether they were confirmed by a generall or by a speciall dispensation, so they were confirmed or dispensed with at all, to hold all their *B*enefices, and to exercise their respective Functions in the Church, which no man can denie. *De Schism. l. 2. p. 305.*

Secondly it may be objected, that it is said in the Dispensation, *licet nulliter & de facto obtenuerint*, *Although they had obteined* their Benefices and Promotions *ineffectually and onely in fact* without right: which

doth intimate that their Orders were voide and null, before they had obteined this dispensation. I answer, that he stiled them voide and null, not absolutely but respectively, *quoad exercitium*, becaufe by the Roman law they might not be lawfully exercifed without a Dispensation: but not *quoad Characterem*, as to the Character. If they had wanted any thing neceſſary to the imprinting of the Character, or any thing eſſentiall by the inſtitution of Chriſt, the Popes Diſpenſation and Confirmation had been but like a ſeale put to a blanke piece of paper. And ſo the Cardinalls diſpenſation in generall, and particularly for Benefices and Eccleſiaſticall Promotions, Diſpenſations, and Graces given by ſuch Order as the lawes of the Realme allowed and preſcribed, in King *Henries* time and King *Edwards* time, was then and there ratified by act of Parliament.

Laſtly, that this Diſpenſation was afterwards confirmed by the Pope, I prove by the confeſſion of *Sanders* himſelf, though a malicious enemy. *He* (that is Cardinall *Pole*, in a publick Inſtrument ſet forth in the name and by the authority of the Pope) *Confirmed all Biſhop*

which

which had bene made in the former Schiſme, ſo they were Catholick in their judgment of Religion, and the ſix new Bishopricks which King Henry had erected in the time of the Schiſme. And this writing being affixed to the Statute, was published with the reſt of the Decrees of that Parliament, and their minds were pacified. All which things were eſtablished and confirmed afterwards, by the Letters of Pope Paul *the fourth.* De Schiſm. l. 2. p. 350.

We have ſeene, that there were a competent number of Proteſtant Bishops beyond Exception to make a Conſecration: And ſo the neceſſity, which is their onely *Baſis* or Foundation of the *Nagges head* Conſecration, being quite taken away, this prodigious fable having nothing els to ſupport the incredibilities and inconſiſtencies of it, doth melt away of it ſelf like winter ice.

A fifth reaſon

The fifth reaſon is drawen from that well known principle in Rethorick, *Cui bono?* or what advantage could ſuch a conſecration, as the *Nagges head* Conſecration is pretended to have been, bring to the

Consecraters or the persons consecrated, God and Nature never made any thing in vaine. The haire of the head, the nailes upon the fingers ends, do serve both for ornament and muniment. The leafes defend the blossomes, the blossomes produce the fruite, which is Natures end. In sensitives, the Spider doth not weave her webbes, nor the silly Bee make her celles in vaine. But especially intellectuall creatures have alwaies some end of their Actions. Now consider, what good such a mock Consecratiõ could doe the persons so consecrated? Could it helpe them to the possession of their Bishopricks by the law of England? Nothing lesse. There is such a concatenation of our English Customes and Recordes, that the counterfeiting of of any one can do no good, except they could counterfeite them all, which is impossible.

When any Bishops See becommeth voide, there issueth a Writ out of the Exchequer to seise the Temporalties into the Kings hand, as being the ancient and well knowne Patron of the English Church; leaving the Spiritualties to the Arch Bishop or to the Deane and Chapiter, according to the custome of the place. Next the King

granteth his *Conge d'Eſlire* or his Licenſe to chuſe a Bishop, to the Deane and Chapiter; upon the receite of this Licenſe, the Deane and Chapiter, within a certein number of daies, chuſe a Bishop, and certifie their Election to the King, under the common ſeale of the Chapiter.

Upon the returne of this Certificate, the King granteth out a Commiſſion under the great ſeale of England to the Arch Bishop, or in the vacancy of the Arch Bishoprick to ſo many Bishops, to examine the Election: and if they find it fairely made to confirme it, and after Confirmation to proceed to the Conſecration of the perſon elected, according to the forme preſcribed by the Church of England. This Commiſſion or Mandate muſt paſſe both through the Signet office and Chancery, and be atteſted by the Clerkes of both thoſe offices, and ſigned by the Lord Chanceller and Lord privy ſeale, and be inrolled. So as it is morally impoſſible there should be any forgery in it.

Vpon the receite of this Mandate, the Bishops who are authoriſed by the King, do meete firſt at *Bowes* Church in *London*, where with the aſſiſtence of the Chiefe Eccleſiaſticall Judges of the Realme, the

Deane of the Arches, the Iudges of the Prerogative and Audience, with their Registers to Actuate what is done, they do solemnely in forme of law confirme the election. Which being done, and it being late before it be done, the Commissioners and Iudges were and are sometimes invited to the *Nagges head* to a dinner, as being very neare *Bowes* Church, and in those daies the onely place of note. This meeting led Mr. *Neale* (a man altogether unacquainted with such formes,) into this fooles Paradise; first to suspect, and upon suspicion to conclude, that they were about an Ordination there, and lastly to broach his brainsick conceites in corners; and finding them to be greedily swallowed by such as wished them true, to assert his owne drowsy suspicion for a reall truth. But the mischief is, that Doctor *Parker* who was to be consecrated, was not present in person, but by his Proxie.

After the Confirmation is done, commonly about three or foure daies, (but as it happened in Arch Bishop *Parkers* case nine daies,) the Commissioners proceed to the Consecration; for the most part out of their respect to the Archbishop in the Chappell at *Lambeth*, with Sermon, Sacrament, and all solemnity requisite, according to the forme

pre-

prescribed by the Church of *England*; in the presence of publick Notaries or sworne Officers, who reduce every thing that is done with all the circumstances into Acts, and enter them into the Register of the See of *Canterbury*. Where they are carefully kept by the principall Officer in a publicke office, as Recordes, where every one who desireth may view them from time to time, and have a copy of them if he please. And it is to be noted, that at any Consecration, especially of an Arch-Bishop, great numbers of principall Courtiers and Citizens are present: so as it is no more possible to counterfeite such a Consecration, then to walke invisible upon the Exchange at noone day.

After the Consecration is done, the person Consecrated is not presently admitted to his Bishoprick. First the Arch Bishop maketh his certificate of the Consecration with all the circumstances of it, under his Arch-Episcopall seale: Thereupon the King taketh the new Bishops oath of fealty and commands that he be put into the Actuall possessiō of his Bishoprick: Then he is inthroned, and at his Inthronisation his Ordination is publickly read: Then he injoieth his Spiritualties: Then issueth a Writ out of the Exchequer to the Sherif, to restore him to the Temporalties of his Bishoprick.

This

This custome is so ancient, so certein, so generall, that no Englishman can speak against it.

Here we see evidently how al things do pursue one another, and what a necessary and essentiall connexion there is between them. So as the stealing of an Election or the stealing of a Consecration, can give no man a Bishoprick, as Mr. *Neale* dreamed. He that would advantage himself that way, must falsifie all the Records both Eccleſiasticall and Civill. He must falsifie the Recordes of the Chancery, of the Signet office, of the Exchequer, of the Registries, of the Bishop, of the Deane and Chapiter. He must counterfeit the hands and seales of the King, of the Archbishop, of the Lord Chanceller, the Lord Privy seale, of the Clerkes and publike Notaries, which is not imaginable. But Mr. *Neale*, who first devised this dreame (or somebody for him) had had more experience of our English lawes and Customes, he would have feined a more probable tale, or have held his peace for ever.

Answer me, They who are calumniated to have had their Consecration at the *Neages head*, did they meane to conceale it or

have it kept ſecret? Then what good could it do them? *De non exiſtentibus & non apparentibus eadem eſt ratio*: If it were concealed, it was all one as if it had never bene. Or did they meane to have it published? Such an Ordination had bene ſo farre from helping them to obteine a Bishoprick, that it had rendred them uncapable of a Bishoprick for ever: And moreover ſubjected both the Conſecraters and the Conſecrated to deprivation, and degradation, and a Premunire or forfeiture of their lands goods and liberties, and all that were preſent at it to excommunication. *Rome* is a fitte place wherein to publish ſuch Lubribious fables as this; where they can perſwade the people, that the Proteſtants are ſtupid creatures, who have loſt their Religion, their reaſon, and ſcarcely reteine their humaine shapes. It is too bold an attempt, to obtrude ſuch counterfeit wares in *England*.

FINIS

CHAP. IIII.

The sixth and seventh reasons, that all the Records of England are diametrally opposite to their Relation, and do establish our Relation.

HItherto we have beene taking in the out workes: Now I come directly to assault this Castle in the aire. That which hath bene said already is sufficient to perswade any man, who is not brimme full of prejudice and partiality: The other five reasons which follow next, have power to compell all men, and command their assent.

My sixth reason is taken from the diametrall oppositiō which is betweene this fabulous relation of the *Nagges head* Ordination and all the Recordes of *England*, both Ecclesiasticall and civill. First for the time. The Romanists say, that this Ordination was before the ninth of *September* Ann. 1559: but it is apparent by all the Recordes of the Chancery, all the distinct Letters Patents or Commissions for their Respective Confirmations, and Consecrations, whereupon they were consecrated, did issue out long after; namely, Arch Bishop *Parkers* Letters Patents (which were the first) upon the sixth day of *December* following. Next the

Com-

Commissions for *Grindall*, *Cox* and *Sands*; Then for *Bullingham*, *Iewel*, and *Davis*. Then for *Bentham* and *Barkley*: and in the yeare following for *Horn*, *Alley*, *Scambler*, and *Pilkinton*. He that hath a mind to see the Copies of these Commissions, may find them Recorded *Verbatim* both in the Rolles of the Arch Bishops Register, and in the Rolles of the Chancery. To what end were all these Letters Patents, to authorise so many Confirmatiõs and Consecrations, if the Consecrations were done and past long before? No mans Election can be confirmed in *England*, but by virtue of the Kings Letters Patents. Therefore the Letters Patents must precede the Confirmation and Consecration, not follow after it three moneths, or foure moneths, or six moneths, and in some of thẽ above a yeare. And as by the Recordes of the Chancery, so their relation is proved to be a notorious fable, by all the Ecclesiasticall Recordes; first of their severall and distinct Confirmations, which pursued their Commissions punctually; Then of their severall and distinct Consecrations which pursued their Confirmations punctually. He who desireth to see these, may finde Authentick Recordes of them all, both Confirmations and Consecrations

Rot. parv. 14. 2. El.

tions, in the Register of the Arch Bishop of *Canterbury*. It is not the forging of one Recorde that would serve the turne: Either all these Recordes must be forged, or the *Nagges head* Ordination is a silly senslesse fable.

Lastly after the Consecration followeth the Installement or Inthronisation, which is to be found in the Register of the Deane and Chapiter: And the Restitution of the new Bishop to his Temporalties by virtue of the Kings Writ, mentioning the Confirmation and oath of fealty to the King, as being temporall things. Observe how every one of these do pursue another. Arch Bishop *Parkers* Commission issued *December* the sixth, his Confirmation followed *December* the ninth, his Consecration *December* the seventeenth, his Inthronisation forthwith, and the Restitution to his temporalties the first of *March* ensuing, that is, at the later end of the very next terme: But by their Relation, the Consecration was long before the Election was confirmed, which can not be; The Letter Patents to license the Confirmation and Consecration, come out three moneths after the Consecration was done, which is incredible. As for the Confirmation, Mr

Ne

Neale who was their contriver, knew not what it was. The installement followed three moneths after the Consecration, and the Restitution to the Temporalties six moneths after; which have no probability.

Thus for the time, next for the place. Their lying Relation saith, the elected Bishops were consecrated at the *Nagges head*: All the Ecclesiasticall Recordes say they were consecrated at *Lambeth*. The Kings Commission injoineth a legall Consecration according to the forme prescribed by law: Such a legall Consecration ours at *Lambeth* was; Such a legall Consecration theirs at the *Nagges head* was not, neither for the place, nor for the rites, nor for the essentialls of Consecration. And without good assurance that the Consecration was legall, neither the person consecrated could have bene inthroned, nor made his oath of fidelity to the King, nor have bene restored to his Temporalties: but he was inthroned, and did his fealty, and was restored to his temporalties, that is as much as to say, that his Consecration was legally performed at *Lambeth*, not illegally at the *Nagges head*.

Thirdly for the Consecrater. That fabulous Relation feigneth that there was but one

one Consecrater, or at the most two: the authentick Recordes of the Church of *England* testifie, that there were foure Consecraters. The Letters Patents require that there should be four Consecraters, and without an authentick Certificate that there were four Consecraters, the King's Writ for restitution had not issued.

They feine that they imposed hands mutually, *Scory* upon them and they upon *Scorie*: But the Recordes witnesse that *Scory* was solemnely ordeined Bishop in *King Edwards* time, the thirteenth day of *August* Anno. 1551, by the Arch Bishop of *Canterbury*, the Bishop of *London* and the Suffragan Bishop of *Bedford*; and needed not to be reordeined at the *Nagges head*.

Reg. Cran. fol. 334.

Lastly, for the persons consecrated, some of them feine that all the elected Bishops and all of them say that many of them, were consecrated together at one time with Arch Bishop *Parker*: But all the Records both Civill and Ecclesiasticall do testifie the contrary, that they had severall Commissions, severall Confirmations, severall Consecrations, upon severall daies, in severall moneths, in several yeares, severall Consecraters; as appeareth most evidently not onely by the Authentick Recordes of the See of *Canterbury*, but also by the Records

of the Chancery, And particularly by the severall Commissions directed expressly to ArchBishop *Parker*, as a Bishop actually consecrated, for the Consecration of all the rest, the three first of which Commissions or Letters Patents beare date the eighteenth of *December* An: 1559, that is the very next day after ArchBishop *Parkers* Consecration; for the Confirmation and Consecration of *Grindall*, *Coxe*, and *Sands*, three of those elected Bishops. He that doubteth of the truth of these Letters Patents, may find them recorded *verbatim*, both in the Arch-Bishops Registry, and in the Rolles. If they were confirmed and consecrated by Arch-Bishop *Parker*, then they were not consecrated together with Arch-Bishop *Parker*, as in that lyng relation is affirmed. And with this their subsequent Installements and Restitutions do exactly agree. Either all the Recordes of *England* must be false, or this silly fable of the *Nagges head* is a prodigious forgery.

Thus we have seene how the Recordes of *England*, civill and Ecclesiasticall, do contradict this tale of a tub. My seventh reason sheweth how the same Recordes do confirme and Establish our relation. We *The seventh Reason.*

say first (that the See of *Canterbury* being voide by the death of Cardinall *Pole*, (who died as some say the very same day with Queene *Mary*, others say the day following,) the Queene granted her *conge d'eslire* to the Deane and Chapiter of *Canterbury* to chuse an Arch-Bishop. This is clearly proved by the authentick Copy of the *conge d'eslire* itself in the Rolles. *Regina dilectis sibi in Christo Decano & Capitulo Ecclesiæ Metropoliticæ Cantuariensis salutem &c.*

The seventh reason.

Rot. pa. 6. 1. Elis.

Examinatur

Richard Broughton.

Secondly we say, that the Deane and chapiter having received this license, did chuse Doctor *Mathew Parker* for their Arch-Bishop. This is apparent by the Queenes Commission for his Confirmation and Restitution, wherein there is this clause. *And the said Deane and Chapiter, by virtue of our license, have chosen our beloved in Christ Mathew Parker Professor of Theology, for Arch-Bishop and Pastour to them and the aforesaid Church, as by their letters Patents directed to us thereupon it appeareth more fully.*

Thirdly

Thirdly the Queene accepting this Election, was graciously pleased to issue out two Commissions for the legall Confirmation of the said Election, and consecrating of the said Arch-Bishop. The former dated the ninth of *September* Anno 1559, Directed to six Bishops, *Cuthbert* Bishop of *Durham*, *Gilbert* Bishop of *Bath*, *David* Bishop of *Peterburough*, *Anthony* Bishop of *Landaff*, *William Barlow* Bishop, and *Iohn Scory* Bishop, in these words.

Elisabeth dei gratia Angliæ &c. Reverendis in Christo Patribus Cuthberto Episcopo Dunelmensi, Gilberto Bathovienſi Episcopo, Davidi Episcopo Burgi Sancti Petri, Anthonio Landavenſi Episcopo. VVillelmo Barlo Episcopo, & Iohanni Scory Episcopo, Salutem. Cum vacante nuper Sede Archi-Episcopali Cantuarienſi per mortem naturalem Domini Reginaldi Pole Cardinalis, ultimi & immediati Archi-Episcopi & Pastoris ejusdem, ad humilem petitionem Decani & Capituli Ecclesiæ nostræ Cathedralis & Metropoliticæ Christi Cantuarienſis, eisdem per literas nostras patentes licentiam concesserimus

Ro: Pars 2. 1. Elis.

alium sibi eligendi in Archiepiscopum & Pastorem Sedis prædictæ. Ac iidem Decanus & Capitulum vigore & obtentu licentiæ nostræ prædictæ, dilectum nobis in Christo Magistrum Matthæum Parker Sacræ Theologiæ Professorem sibi & Ecclesiæ prædictæ elegerint in Archiepiscopum & Pastorem, prout per literas suas patentes Sigillo eorum communi sigillatas, nobis inde directas, plenius liquet & apparet. Nos electionem illam acceptantes, eidem electioni Regium nostrum assensum adhibuimus pariter & favorem, & hoc vobis tenore præsentium significamus. Rogantes, ac in fide & dilectione quibus nobis tenemini firmiter præcipiendo mandantes, quatenus eundē Magistrum Matthæum Parker in Archepiscopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ Cathedralis & Metropolitica, Christi Cantuariensis prædictæ, sic ut præfertur electum, electionemque prædictam confirmare, & eundem Magistrum Matthæum in Archiepiscopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ prædictæ consecrare, cæteraque omnia & singula peragere,

qua

quæ veſtro in hac parte incumbant officio Paſtorali, juxta formam Statutorum in ea parte editorum & proviſorum, velitis cum effectu. In cujus rei teſtimonium &c. Teſte Regina apud Redgrave, nono die Septembris Anno Regni Eliſabethæ Angliæ &c. primo.

Per breve de privato Sigillo.

Examinatur R I: BROVGHTON.

Now if any man deſire a reaſon why this firſt Commiſſion was not executed, the beſt acconnt I can give him is this, That it was directed to ſix Bishops, without an [*aut minus, or at the leaſt foure of you*]: ſo as if any one of the ſix were ſick or abſent, or refuſed, the reſt could not proceed to Confirme, or Conſecrate. And that ſome of them did refuſe, I am very apt to beleeve, becauſe three of them not long after were deprived. But the Reader may note, Firſt that there were three Proteſtant Bishops in that Firſt Commiſſion. They who were ſuch punctuall obſervers of the law of *England*, that they would not proceed to conſecrate without a fourth, in the va-

cancy of both the Archiepiſcopall Sees, certeinly would never give way to a private profane Ordination at the *Nagges head*, by one ſingle Bishop. And ſecondly, that for all their pretended intelligence, our Engliſh Romish writers are great ſtrangers to the true paſſages of thoſe times, knowing nothing but what they heare at *Rome*, or *Rhemes*, or *Doway*. If it were otherwiſe we should have heard of this Commiſſion ſooner.

The ſecond Letters Patents which were executed, were dated the ſixth of *December* following, directed to *Anthony* Bishop of *Landaff*, *William Barlow* ſometimes Bishop of *Bath*, now Elect Bishop of *Chiceſter*, *Iohn Scory* ſometimes Bishop of *Chicheſter*, now Elect Bishop of *Hereford*, *Miles Coverdale* ſometimes Bishop of Exceter, *Richard* Suffragan Bishop of *Bedford*, *Iohn* Suffragan Bishop of *Thetford*, and *Iohn Bale* Bishop of *Oſſory* in *Ireland*, in theſe words.

Regina &c. Reverendis in Chriſto Patribus Anthonio Landavenſi Epiſcopo, Willelmo Barlow quondam Bathonienſi Epiſcopo, nunc Ciceſtrenſi Electo

clo, Iohanni Scory quondam Ciceſtrenſi Epiſcopo, nunc Electo Herefordienſi, Miloni Coverdale quondam Exonienſi Epiſcopo, Richardo Bedfordenſi, Iohanni Thedfordenſi, Epiſcopis Suffraganeis, Iohanni Bale Oſſorienſi Epiſcopo, Salutem. Cum vacante nuper Sede Archiepiſcopali Cantuarienſi per mortem naturalem Domini Reginaldi Pole Cardinalis, ultimi & immediati Archiepiſcopi & Paſtoris ejuſdem, ad humilem petitionem Decani & Capituli Eccleſiæ noſtræ Cathedralis & Metropoliticæ Chriſti Cantuarienſis, eiſdem per Literas noſtras Patentes licentiam conceſſerimus alium ſibi Eligendi in Archiepiſcopum & Paſtorem Sedis prædictæ, Ac iidem Decanus & Capitulum vigore & obtentu Licentiæ noſtræ prædictæ, dilectum nobis in Chriſto Magiſtrum Matthæum Parker Sacræ Theologiæ Profeſſorem, ſibi & Eccleſiæ prædictæ Elegerunt in Archi-Epiſcopum & Paſtorem, prout per Literas ſuas patentes nobis inde directas plenius liquet & apparet. Nos

electionem illam acceptantes, eidem electioni Regium nostrum assensum adhibuimus pariter & favorem, & hoc vobis tenore præsentium significamus. Regantes ac in fide & dilectione quibus Nobis tenemini firmiter præcipiendo mandantes, quatenus vos aut minus quatum vestrum, eundem Matthæum Parker in Archi-Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ Cathedralis & Metropoliticæ Christi Cantuarienſis prædictæ ſicut præfertur Electum, electionemq; prædictam Confirmare, & eundem Magistrum Matthæum Parker in Archi-Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ prædictæ consecrare, Cæteraque omnia & singula peragere, quæ vestro in hac parte incumbant officio Pastorali, juxta formam statutorum in ea parte editorum & provisorum, velitis cum effectu. Supplentes nihilominus ſuprema Authoritate nostra Regia, ex mero motu & certa Scientia nostris, ſi quid aut in his quæ juxta mandatum nostrum prædictum per vos fient, aut in vobis, aut vestrum aliquo, conditione, Statu, facultate vestris, ad

præ-

præmissa perficienda desit aut deerit eorum, quæ per statuta hujus Regni nostri aut per leges Ecclesiasticas in hac parte requiruntur, aut necessaria sunt, temporis ratione & rerum necessitate id postulante. In cujus Rei &c. Teste Regina apud VVestmonasteriū sexto die Decembris, Anno Regni Reginæ Elisabeth Angliæ &c. Secundo.

Examinatur.

RI: BROUGHTON.

Before I proceed further, to prevent cavills, I must acquainte the Reader, that the Suffragan Bishop of *Bedford* is misnamed *Richard* in the Rolles; by what mistake or errour, after so long time it is folly to inquire. We may Conjecture how it might easily, and most probably did come to passe: but to say positively how it did come to passe, whether it was the errour of the transcriber, or the mistake of him who gave the instructions, or it was no faulte at all, (he might have two names, as many have had, and many have

have and owne them severally,) is not possible. In the Eccleſiaſticall Regiſter of the Church, he is alwaies ſtiled by his right name *John*, throughout all the Acts of the Confirmation and Conſecration of Arch Bishop *Parker*. Once his name had been written *Richard*, but it was corrected, and my friend aſſureth me, that it is the onely word in that long narration which is expunged or interlined; So exact is that Recorde. This is certeine, his right name was *John*, as it is in the Regiſter. To this the Recordes of his own Conſecration, and twenty other Recordes do beare witneſſe.

But as to the validity of the Act or Ordination, it is not materiall whether his name were *John* or *Richard*, or both, or neither. So he was truely ordeined himſelf, and did truely concurre in ordeining, it is no matter how he is Stiled in the Commiſſion, or in the Regiſter. Regall Commiſſions are no eſſentialls of Ordination. Notariall Acts are no eſſentialls of Ordination. The miſnaming of the Baptiſt in a Paiish Regiſter doth not make voi the Baptiſme. When Popes do conſecra themſelves, (as they do ſometimes), they it by the names of *Paul*, or *Alexander* o

Vrban

Vrbanus, or *Innocentius*: yet these are not the names which were imposed upon them at their Baptismes, or at their Confirmations, but such names as themselves have been pleased to assume. But to come to more serious matter.

There are two differences betweene these two Commissions. The first is an [*aut minus, Or at the least foure of you*], which clause is prudently inserted into all Commissions, where many Commissioners are named, least the sickness, or absence, or neglect of any one or more, might hinder the worke. The question is, why they are limited to foure, when the Canons of the Catholick Church require but three. The answer is obvious, because the Statutes of *England* do require foure in case one of the Consecraters be not an Arch Bishop, or deputed by one. Three had bene enough to make a valide Ordination, yea to make a Canonicall Ordination; and the Queene might have dispensed with her owne lawes: but she wonld have the Arch *B*ishop to be ordeined both according to the canons of the Catholick Church, and the known lawes of England.

The second difference betweene the two Commissions is this, that there is a *Supplemes*

plenties in the later Commission, which is not in the former. [*Supplyng by our Soveraigne authority all defects either in the Execution, or in the Executers of this Commission, or any of them*]. The Court of *Rome* in such like instruments have ordinarily such dispensative clauses, for more abundant caution, whether there be need of them or not, to *relaxe all sentences censures, and penalties inflicted either by the law or by the Iudge.*

But still the question is, to what end was this clause inserted? I answer, it is enough, if it serve (as the Court of *Rome* useth it,) for a certeine salve to helpe any latent impediment, though there be none. A superfluous clause doth not vitiate a writing. Some thinke it might have reference to Bishop Coverdales *syde woollen gowne*, which he used at the Consecration *toga lanea talari utebatur*. That was uncanonicall indeed, and needed a dispensation for him that used it, not for him who was consecrated. But this was so slender a defect and so farre from the heart or essence of Ordinatiõ; especially where the three other Cõsecraters, (which is the canonicall number) where formally and regularly habited that it was not worth an intimation unto

the great seale of *England*. This *Miles Coverdale* had been both validely and legally ordeined Bishop, and had as much power to ordeine as the Bishop of *Rome* himself, if he had been Roman Catholick in his judgment, he had been declared by Cardinall *Pole* as good a Bishop, as either *Bonner*, or *Thirleby*, or any of the rest.

Others thinke, this clause might have relation to the present condition of Bishop *Barlow* and Bishop *Scory*, who were not yet inthroned into their new Bishopricks. It might be so, but if it was, it was a great mistake in the Lawiers who drew up the Commission. The Office and the Benefice of a Bishop are two distinct things; Ordination is an act of the Key of Order, and a Bishop uninthroned may ordeine as well as a Bishop inthroned. The Ordination of Suffragan Bishops, who had no peculiar Bishoprickes, was alwaies admitted and reputed as good in the Catholick Church, (if the Suffragans had Episcopall Ordination,) as the Ordination of the greatest Bishops in the wolrd.

But since this clause doth extend it self both to the Consecration and the Consecraters, I am confident that the onely

ground

ground of it was that same exception, or rather cavill which Bishop *Bonner* did afterwards make againſt the legality of Bishop *Hornes* Conſecration; which is all that either *Stapleton* or any of our Adverſaries have to pretend againſt the legality of the Ordination of our firſt Proteſtant Bishops: that *they were not ordeined according to the præſcript of our very Statutes.*

I have ſet downe this caſe formerly in my replication to the Bishop of *Chalcedon*. But to avoide wrangling, I will put it downe in the very wordes of the Statute. *King Edward the Sixth in his time by authority of Parliament, cauſed the booke of Common Praier and Adminiſtration of Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of England, to be made and ſet forth, not onely for one uniforme Order of Service, Commō Prayer, and Adminiſtration of Sacraments to be uſed whithin this Realme, but alſo did adde and put to the ſaid booke, a very godly Order manner and forme, how Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Prieſts, Deacons and Miniſters, should from time*

to time be consecrated, made, and ordered, within this Realme. Afterwards it followeth, that in *the time of Queene Mary, the severall Acts and statutes made in the secõd, third, fourth, fifth and sixth yeares of King Edward, for the authorising and allowing of the said booke of Common praier and other the premisses, were repealed.* Lastly the Statute addeth, that *by an Act made in the first yeare of Queene Elisabeth, entituled An act for the uniformity of Common prayer and service in the Church, and administration of Sacraments, the said booke of Common Praier and Administration of Sacraments, and other the said Orders Rites and Ceremonies before mẽtioned, and all things therein conteined, is fully stablished and authorised to be used in all places within the Realme.*

This is the very case related by the Parliament. Now the exception of Bishop *Bonner*, and *Stapleton*, and the rest, was this. *The booke of Ordination* was expressly established by name by *Edward* the Sixth,

And

And that Act was expresly repealed by Queene Mary: But *the booke of Ordination* was not expresly restored by Queene *Elisabeth*, but onely in generall termes under the name and notion of the Booke of Common Praiers and administration of Sacraments, and other orders rites and Ceremonies. Therefore they who were ordeined according to the said forme of Ordination in the beginning of Queene *Elisabeths* time, were not legally ordeined. And those Bishops which had bene ordeined according to that forme in King *Edwards* time, though they were legally ordeined then, yet they were not legall *Bishops* now, because Queene *Maries* statute was still in force, and was not yet repealed.

Is this all? Take courage Reader, Here is nothing that toucheth the validity of our Ordination, but onely the legality of it, which is easily satisfied. First I answer that Queene *Maries* Statute was repealed sufficiently, even as to the booke of Ordination; as appeareth by the very words of the Statute which repealed it. *And that the said booke, with the order of Service and of the administration of Sacraments rites and Ceremonies, shall be after the feast of St. Iohn Baptist next in full force and effect, any thing*

Queene

Queene *Maries* Statute of repeale *to the contrary in any wise not withstanding*. That the booke of Ordination was a part of this booke, and printed in this booke in King *Edwards* daies, besides the expresse testimony of the Statute in the eighth of Queene *Elisabeth* we have the authority of the Canons of the Church of *England*, which call it singularly *the booke of Common Praier, and of Ordering Bishops Priests and Deacons*. It is our forme of praier upon that occasion, as much as our forme of baptising, or administring the holy Eucharist, or our forme of confirming, or marryng, or visiting the sick. *Can.* 36

Secondly, it is also a part of our forme of Administration of the Sacraments. We denie not Ordination to be a Sacrament, though it be not one of those two Sacraments, which are generally necessary to salvation.

Thirdly, although it were supposed that Ordination were no Sacrament, nor the booke of Ordination a part of the booke of Common praier: yet no man can denie that it is a part of our Ecclesiasticall rites and ceremonies, and under that notion sufficiently authorised. Lastly,

Ejus est legem interpretari cujus est condere.

They who have legislative power to make a law, have legislative power to expound a law. Queene *Elisabeth* and her Parliament made the law, Queene *Elisabeth* and her Parliament expounded the law, by the same authority that made it; declaring that under the booke of Common Praier, the forme of Ordination was comprehended and ought to be understood. And so ended the grand cavill of Bishop *Bonner* and Doctor *Sapleton* and the rest, of the illegality of our Ordination; shewing nothing but this, how apt a drowning cause is to catch hold of every reed,

8. *Elc.* *cap.* 1.

That the *Supplemes* or this dispensative clause had Relation to this cavill, (which as it did breake out afterwards into an open controversy, so it was then whispered in corners,) is very evident by one clause in the Statute: that *for the avoiding of all questions and ambiguities that might be objected against the lawfull Confirmations, investings, and Consecrations of any Arch-Bishops, Bishops &c. the Queene in her Letters Patents had not onely used such words as had bene accustomed to be used by King Henry and King Edward, but also diverse other generall wordes, whereby her Highnesse by her Supreme power and authority, hath dispensed with all causes and doubts of*

any

any imperfection or disability that could be objected. The end of this clause and that Statute was the same: And this was the onely question or ambiguity which was moved.

Yet although the case was so evident, and was so judged by the Parliament, that the forme of Consecration was comprehended under the name and notion of the booke of Common praier &c: yet in the indictment against Bishop *Bonner*, I do commend the discretion of our Iudges, and much more the moderation of the Parliament. Criminall lawes should be written with a beame of the sun, without all ambiguity.

Lastly, before I leave this third consideration, I desire the Reader to observe three things with me. First, that this dispensative neither hath, nor can be construed to have any reference to any Consecration that was already past, or that was acted by Bishop *Scory* alone; as that silly Consecration at the *Nagges head* is supposed to have been.

Secondly, that this dispensative clause doth not extend at all to the institution of Christ, or any essentiall of Ordination, nor to the Canons of the universall Church: but

onely to the Statutes and Ecclesiasticall lawes of England. *Si quid deest aut decet eorum quæ per Statuta hujus Regni nostri, aut per leges Ecclesiasticas requiruntur.*

Thirdly, that the Commissioners authorised by these Letters Parēts to cōfirme and consecrate Arch Bishop *Parker*, did make use of this *Supplentes* or dispensative power in the Confirmation of the Election, which is a politicall Act, (as by the words of the Confirmation in the next paragraph shall appeare,) but not in the Consecration, which is a purely spirituall act, and belongeth meerely to the Key of Order.

Fourthly we say, that by virtue of these Letters Patents of December the sixth, foure of the Commissioners therein named did meete in *Bowes* Church, upon the ninth day of the same moneth: and then and there with the advise of the chiefe Ecclesiasticall Lawiers of the Kingdome, the Deane of the Arches, the Iudges of the Prerogative and Audience, did solemnely confirme the election. This is proved by the Recorde of the Confirmation or definitive sentence it self, in these words.

In

In Dei nomine, Amen. Nos Willelmus quondam Bathonienſis & VVellenſis Epiſcopus nunc Ciceſtrenſis Electus, Iohannes Scory quondam Ciceſtrenſis Epiſcopus nunc Electus Herefordenſis, Milo Coverdale quondam Exonienſis Epiſcopus, & Iohannes Bedford Epiſcopus Suffraganeus, Mediantibus literis Commiſſionalibus Illuſtriſſimæ Reginæ fidei Defenſatricis &c. Commiſſionarij, cum hac clauſula videlicet [unæ cum Iohanne Thetfordenſi Suffraganeo & Iohanne Bale Oſſorienſi Epiſcopo], Et etiam cum hac clauſula [Quatenus vos aut ad minus quatuor veſtrum], Nec non & hac adjectione [Supplentes nihil ominus &c.] ſpecialiter & legitime Deputati, &c. Idcirco nos Commiſſionarii Regii antedicti, de & cum aſſenſu Iuriſperitorum cum quibus in hac parte communicavimus, prædictam Electionē Suprema Authoritate dictæ Dominæ noſtræ Reginæ nobis in hac parte Commiſſa Confirmamus Supplētes ex Suprema Authoritate Regia, ex mero principis motu & certa Scientia nobis delegata, quic-

quid in hac electione fuerit defectum. Tum in his quæ juxta mandatum nobis creditum a nobis factum & processum est, aut in nobis aut aliquo nostrum, conditione, Statu, facultate ad hæc perficienda deest aut deerit. Tum etiam eorum quæ per statuta hujus Regni Angliæ, aut per leges Ecclesiasticas in hac parte requisita sunt aut necessaria, prout temporis ratio & rerum præsentium necessitas id postulant, per hanc nostram sententiam definitivam, sive hoc nostrum finale decretum &c.

I cite this the more largely, that our Adversaries may see what use was made of the dispensation, which they cavill so much against: But in the Consecration which is an act of the Key of order, they made no use at all of it. This is likewise clearly proved by the Queenes mandate for the restitution of Arch Bishop *Parker* to his Temporalties, wherein there is this clause. [*Cui quidem electioni & personæ sic Electæ Regium assensum nostrum adhibuimus & favorem, ipsiusque fidelitatem nobis debitam pro dicto Archi-Episcopatu recepimus.*]

Rot. pars 14. 2. El.

Fifthly, we say that eight daies after the Con-

Confirmation, that is to say the 17. of December Anno 1559, the same Commissioners did proceed to the Consecration of Arch Bishop *Parker*, in the Archi-Episcopall *Chappell* at *Lambeth*, according to the forme prescribed by the Church of England, with solemne Praiers and Sermon, and the holy Eucharist; at which great numbers of grave persons communicated with him at that time, [*frequens gravissimorum hominum cœtus.*] This is proved evidently by the authentick Recordes of the Consecration, as they are still and alwaies have been to be seen, in the publick Registry of the Archi-Episcopall See of *Canterbury*.

Registrum Reverendissimi in Christo Patris & Domini, Domini Matthæi Parker &c. Principio Sacellum tapetibus ad Orientem adornabatur, solum vero panno rubro insternebatur, &c. And so first setting downe both how the Chappell was adorned for the Consecration, and what habit and garments as well the Consecraters as the person who was to be consecrated did weare, both at the Praiers and Sermon, as likewise at the holy Sacrament and Consecration, it proceedeth to the Consecration itself,

Reg. Park. f. 1. 2.

Finito tandem Evangelio, Herefordensis Electus, Bedfordensis Suffraganeus, & Milo Coverdale, Archiepiscopum coram Ciceſtrenſi Electo apud menſam in Cathedra ſedente his verbis adduxerunt, Reverende in Deo Pater hunc virum pium pariter atque doctum tibi offerimus atque præſentamus, ut Archiepiſcopus conſecretur. Poſtquam hæc dixiſſent, proferebatur ilico regium Diploma ſive Mandatum pro conſecratione Archi-Epiſcopi, quo per Dominum Doctorem Yale legum Doctorem perlecto, Sacramentum de Regio primatu ſive ſuprema ejus authoritate tuenda, juxta ſtatuta primo anno Regni Sereniſſimæ Reginæ noſtræ Elizabethæ edita & promulgata, ab eodem Archi-Epiſcopo exigebatur. Quod cum ille ſolemniter tactis corporaliter ſacris Evangeliis, conceptis verbis præſtitiſſet, Ciceſtrenſis Electus populum ad orationem hortatus ad Letanias decantandas Choro reſpondence ſe accinxit. Quibus finitis, poſt queſtiones aliquot Archi-Epiſcopo per

Ciceſtren-

Ciceſtrenſem Electum propoſitas, & poſt orationes & ſuffragia quædam juxta formam libri authoritate Parliamenti editi apud deum habita, Ciceſtrenſis, Herefordenſis, Suffraganeus Bedfordenſis, & Milo Coverdallus, manibus Archi-Epiſcopo impoſitis, dixerunt, Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, & excitare memineris gratiam Dei quæ in te eſt per manuum impoſitionem. Dedit enim nobis Deus Spiritum non timoris, ſed Poteſtatis, Charitatis, & Sobrietatis, &c.

This is ſo evident that our Adverſaries have nothing to ſay, but to crie the Recordes are forged. Forgery of Recordes is a grievous crime, and ought to be manifeſtly proved, or the accuſer to ſuffer for his Calumny. Let them tell us who forged them, and when and where they were forged. But they know nothing of it. Did any of the ſucceding Proto-Notaries complaine that they were forged? or ſo much as an under Clerke of the Office, or any man that had once occaſion to view them, and afterwards found ſome change in them?

No

No such thing. Examine all the Officers and Notaries and Clerkes living, whether ever they observed any change in them during their remembrance; And they will all answer, No. And so would all their predecessors since Arch-Bishop *Parkers* time have answered, if they had beē put to their Oathes. Who are they then that accuse them of Forgery? They are the Adversaries of the Church of *England*, who never read one word of them, nor know much what belongeth to such Recordes: But they wish if they be not forged, that they were forged. What would you have me do? If they could answer them otherwise they would; But they can not, and therefore they crie them downe as forged.

It is possible to forge private Acts done in a corner: But to forge a consecration done publickly at *Lambeth*, in Queene *Elizabeths* time, And to forge it so early as it was published to the world, is incredible. Surely these Fathers do not know the Chronicles of the Church, that all things which are done at publick Consecrations, are presently drawne into Acts by principall Notaries, and kept in publick Registries, and the custody of them committed to sworne Officers. And this practise was not

in *England* upon this occaſion, but
h beē obſerved throughout both Provin-
s for time immemoriall. I should not
ſt one Penfull of inke upon an English
an, who either doth know or ought to
ow what credit the law of *England* doth
e to theſe Recordes: But for the ſatis-
ſtion of ſtrangers who are miſled by
h bold calumnies, I will take leave for
ce to prove that, which like the common
inciples of Artes, ought to be taken for
nted, and *De quo nefas eſt dubitare.*
t us trie whether they can ſay more for
Vatican Recordes, then we can for
ſe.

For the preſeut, I produce ſix grounds
convince all thoſe who gainſay them,
e firſt is that value and reſpect which
Lawes of the Kingdome do give them,
t is to allow them to be authentick
ofes; Eſpecially in caſes of this nature,
cerning Spirituall Acts belonging to
Key of Order. If a Clerke have loſt
Letters of Orders, a certificate out
his Regiſtrie, under the Seale of the
h-Bihop, or the hand of the Protono-
, is an authentick proofe. Shall
or three Adverſaries, who are ſtrangers
and

and know little of our affaires, altogethe
unacquainted with our Lawes and Re
cordes, dare without any ground to defam
that for forged, which the Lawes of th
Kingdome do allow for authentick? Eithe
these Recordes are authentick, or Chri
stendome never had an authentick Ec
clesiasticall Record. The very Ac
of our Synods or Convocations are n
more undoubted, then these are.

My second proofe is taken from t
credit of the Publick Notaries, who d
testifie this individuall Consecration, a
draw it up into Acts. The Testimony
two publick Notaries, for matter of fa
maketh full proofe over all *Europe*: but he
at least foure Publick Notaries we
present at this Consecration, and testifi
the truth of these Acts; Whereof two
them were the Principall Publick Nota
in *England*, that is, *Anthony Huse* proto
tary of the See of *Canterbury*, and *Tho
Argall* Registerer of the Prerogative Co
assisted in actuating this Consecration
Thomas Willet and *Iohn Iucent* Pnblick N
taries. Who can make doubt of a m
ter of fact so attested?

But is it further Obſervable that theſe foure publick Notaries were the ſame who did draw Cardinall *Poles* Conſecration into Acts, and atteſt them. Either let theſe Fathers denie that Cardinall *Pole* was Conſecrated, or let them grant that Arch-Biſhop *Parker* was Conſecrated. *Aut utramque negate, aut utrumque concedite.* There are the ſame Proofes for the one and for the other. There needeth no more to be done to ſatisfie any man that hath eyes in his head, but to compare the one Regiſter with the other,

We owe a third ground to the Queenes extraordinary care, who was ſo ſolicitous leaſt ſome Circumſtance in the Politicall part might be defective in ſome *punctilio* of law, by reaſon of the frequent change of the Statutes in the reignes of her Father, Brother, Siſter, and Her ſelf, that she cauſed the Letters Patents to be carefully peruſed by ſix of our moſt eminent Lawiers, who all with one unanimous conſent did certifie, that the Commiſſion was good in law, and that the Conſecraters might proceed legally to Conſeeration upon it; which Certificate ſubſcribed with their

their owne hands is preſerved in the Re-
cordes. So if theſe Recordes be forged
not onely the Acts of the Principall Noo-
ries of *England*, but alſo the hands of
the Principall Lawiers of *England* muſt
be forged for company, which is incre-
dible.

The fourth ground is irrefragable, ta-
ken from the teſtimony and authority of
the Parliament of *England*, in the eighth
yeare of Queen *Eliſabeth*, that was about
ſix yeares after this Conſecration was
acted; which ſpeaking of the great care
was taken in and about the Elections, Con-
firmations, and Conſecrations of Arch-
Bishop *Parker*, and the reſt of thoſe firſt
Bishops in Queene *Eliſabeths* time, for
proofe thereof referreth us to theſe very
Recordes, [*As the Recordes of her Ma-*
jeſties ſaid Fathers and Brothers time,
8. El. c. 1. *and alſo her owne time, will more*
plainly teſtifie and declare]. Doth the
Parliament referre ſubjects to Recordes
which are forged? You ſee the contrary,
that it mentioneth them as authentick, un-
doubted, undeniable proofes of what was
really done.

To

To this unanſwerable reaſon, theſe Fathers pretend to give two anſwers: But they are ſuch as are able to ſatisfie any man, that no anſwer is to be expected. The firſt anſwer is in their printed booke pag. 16, that *the word Recordes is but a generall terme.* As if truth ought not to be regarded in generalls, as well as in particulars. Yet the termes which are added to *Recordes*, that is, [*of her Fathers time, her brothers time, and her time*], are no generall but reſtreining termes.

They adde, that *it is a word of courſe, which men do rather ſuppoſe then examine, when they mention things that have been practiſed in former times.* What latitude theſe Fathers may allow their *Conſitents* in caſe Theology for *words of courſe*, I do not now examine; but what have words of Courſe to do in a printed law? They might as well tell the Parliament in plaine termes, that they lied, or that they ſpake they knew not or regarded not what: as tell them that their words were but *words of courſe.* If theſe wordes of courſe were not true, why did not they confute them then, when all things were freſh in mens memories? No man

can

can beleeve that they did forbeare out of affection to the Parliament, but because they could not then oppose so evident truth.

Yet they conclude it to be *evident, that there were no such Recordes of Parkers consecration.* This is more then words of course, to charge the Parliament directly with an untruth. But how is it evident that there were no such Recordes? because *they were never produced to those Roman Catholick Doctors, who desired to see some evidence of Parkers Consecration.* This is wonderfull. They were cited in printe, they were alleged by the Parliament in the Publick *Lawes* of the *Kingdome*, of which no man can pleade ignorance; and yet they tell us they were never produced. But to satisfie their very pretensions. Their exceptions in those daies were of another nature, either against our English Ordinall, or against the *Legality* of our Bishops; which later exception hath been answered already, and the former shall be answered in due place. The reason why Bishop *Jewel* and Bishop *Horne*, and others did not cite these Recordes more expressely, was no dread at all least they should be found to be counterfeit, but because they had no need

need to cite them, to answer any thing that was objected against them. Either the Roman Catholick writers of those daies were false to their owne interest, to smother a thing which (if it had been true) had been so much to their advantage; which no rationall man can imagine: Or the *Nagges head* Ordination was altogether unknowne and unheard of in those daies; which is most certeine.

But now the Fathers change their note, *could they not be forged as well in Queene* Elisabeths *time as in King* Iames *his reigne?* This is to blow hote and cold with the same breath. Before they demanded, *how it was possible they should be extant then and not produced?* Now they tell us, they might be extant then, and yet forged: Nay, such a dexterity they have in turning all which they touch into gold, that they make this very supposition that they were extant then, to be a proofe against us that they were forged. Therefore they were not produced, because *in Queene Elisabeths time many were living, who would have proved them to be forged.*

Observe first, what honour and respect

our Countrymen do beare to our Princes and Parliaments united. Before they did as good as gave them the lie, And now they make them at the leaſt Acceſſaries to forgery, ſo farre as to avouch and juſtifie forged Recordes. Secondly obſerve, with what confidence and conſcience they ſay that theſe Recordes were never produced: And yet confeſſe that they were cited in Printe, and alleged in our very Statutes. If Bishop *Iewell* and Bishop *Horne* had cited them, (as they would have cited them if they had had occaſion), they could have done no more then was done. Did any man upon this publication go about to convince them of forgery? No I warrant you, The caſe was too plaine to be convinced. The Parliament, and the booke of the lifes of the ſeventy Arch Bishops of *Canterbury* printed by *Iohn Day Anno* 1572. have ſpoiled the Fathers Arguments, [*They were not produced, therefore they were forged*], and furniſhed us with a demonſtrative proofe of the contrary. They were produced and cited in printe, and neither convinced, nor ſo much as accuſed of forgery; Therefore they were not forged.

It ſeemeth this anſwer did not ſatisfie the

the Fathers themſelves: and therefore the one of them hath addeth a ſecond anſwer in the margent, with his penne, in theſe words; *The Act of Parliament relates onely to the Recordes of the Queenes Letters Patents, and not to the Recordes of the Bishops Conſecration or Ordination.* They ſay that gloſſe is accurſed which corrupteth and Contradicteth the text, as this gloſſe doth egregiouſly. The Statute ſpeaketh expreſly, of *the Recordes of Elections and Confirmations and Conſecrations*, which are all of them Eccleſiaſticall Acts, and none of them Recorded in theRolles of Chancery, or any other civill Court of Recordes, but onely in the Eccleſiaſticall Regiſters of the Arch-Bishops, Deanes and Chapiters reſpectively. This anſwer is a groundleſſe evaſion.

My fifth ground to prove that theſe Recordes were not forged, is taken from that booke of the lifes of the ſeventy ſucceding Arch-Bishops of *Canterbury*, printed in *London* in the yeare 1572; wherein the Authour, (that was Arch Bishop *Parker* himſelf,) having deſcribed the Confirmations and Conſecrations of Bishop *Grindall*,

Bishop *Sands*, Bishop *Iewell*, Bishop *Horne*, and all the rest of those first Protestant Bishops, he addeth in the margent, *Hæ confirmationes & consecrationes in Registris apparent*: *These confirmations and consecrations do appeare in the Registers.* Then the Registers were then extant, and not onely extant but publickly printed, whilest all things were fresh in mens memories, yet no man did or durst except against the truth of them; So free they were not onely from corruption, but from suspicion.

The sixth and last ground to prove that the Recordes were not forged, is taken from the agreemeut and concurrence of our civill Recordes (which no man ever doubted of) with our Ecclesiasticall Registers. We have seene the Queenes Letters Patēts, directed to seven other Bishops, for the confirmation and consecration of Arch-Bishop *Parker*, dated the sixth of *December anno* 1559; Therefore upon the sixth of *December* 1559 he was neither Confirmed nor Consecrated. We have seene the Ecclesiasticall Recordes, how by virtue of those very Letters Patents, he was confirmed upon the ninth day, and consecrated upon the seventeenth day of the same Moneth.

Moneth. We find three other Letters Patents, directed to Arch-Bishop *Parker* himself as a Consecrated Bishop, for the Confirmation and Consecration of other Bishops; namely *Richard Coxe*, *Edmund Grindall*, and *Edwin Sandes*, dated the Eighteenth of *December*, that is the very next day after his consecration: Therefore he was then consecrated. And this agreeth exactly with the Ecclesiastical Register.

Elisabeth Dei gratia Angliæ &c. Reverendissimo in Christo Patri & Domino, Matthæo Archi-Episcopo Cantuariensi, totius Angliæ Primati & Metropolitano, &c, Salutem. Rogantes, ac in fide & dilectione quibus nobis tenemini firmiter præcipiendo mandantes, quatenus eundem magistrum Edmundum Grindall in Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Divi Pauli London prædictæ sic ut præfertur Electum, Electionemque prædictam Confirmare, & eundem magistrum Edmundum Grindall in Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ prædictæ consecrare, ceteraque omnia & singula peragere, quæ vestro in hac

parte

Bishop *Sands*, Bishop *Iewell*, Bishop *Horne*, and all the reſt of thoſe firſt Proteſtant Bishops, he addeth in the margent, *Hæ confirmationes & conſecrationes in Regiſtris apparent*: *Theſe confirmations and conſecrations de appeare in the Regiſters*. Then the Regiſters were then extant, and not onely extant but publickly printed, whileſt all things were fresh in mens memories, yet no man did or durſt except againſt the truth of them; So free they were not onely from corruption, but from ſuſpicion.

The ſixth and laſt ground to prove that the Recordes were not forged, is taken from the agreemeut and concurrence of our civill Recordes (which no man ever doubted of) with our Eccleſiaſticall Regiſters. We have ſeene the Queenes Letters Patēts, directed to ſeven other Bishops, for the confirmation and conſecration of Arch-Bishop *Parker*, dated the ſixth of *December anno* 1559; Therefore upon the ſixth of *December* 1559 he was neither Confirmed nor Conſecrated. We have ſeene the Eccleſiaſticall Recordes, how by virtue of thoſe very Letters Patents, he was confirmed upon the ninth day, and conſecrated upon the ſeventeenth day of the ſame

Moneth.

Moneth. We find three other Letters Patents, directed to Arch-Bishop *Parker* himself as a Consecrated Bishop, for the Confirmation and Consecration of other Bishops; namely *Richard Coxe*, *Edmund Grindall*, and *Edwin Sandes*, dated the Eighteenth of *December*, that is the very next day after his consecration: Therefore he was then consecrated. And this agreeth exactly with the Ecclesiasticall Register.

Elisabeth Dei gratia Angliæ &c. Reverendissimo in Christo Patri & Domino, Matthæo Archi-Episcopo Cantuariensi, totius Angliæ Primati & Metropolitano, &c, Salutem. Rogantes, ac in fide & dilectione quibus nobis tenemini firmiter præcipiendo mandantes, quatenus eundem magistrum Edmundum Grindall in Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Divi Pauli London prædictæ sic ut præfertur Electum, Electionemque prædictam Confirmare, & eundem magistrum Edmundum Grindall in Episcopum & Pastorem Ecclesiæ prædictæ consecrare, ceteraque omnia & singula peragere, quæ vestro in hac

parte

parte incumbunt Officio paſtorali &c. Teſte Regina apud weſtmonaſterium, decimo Octavo die Decembris, Anno Reginæ Elizabeth Angliæ &c. ſecundo.

Examinatur per

RICH: BROUGHTON.

Conſimilia Brevia (Eiſdem forma & verbis, mutatis ſolummodo Mutandis) directa ſunt eidem Matthæo Archi-Epiſcopo Cantuarienſi, pro confirmatione Electionis, & conſecratione Richardi Cox Sacræ Theologiæ Profeſſoris in Epiſcopum Elienſem, Et Edwini Sands ſacræ Theologiæ Profeſſoris in Epiſcopum VVigornenſem, Omnia ſub dato prædicto & in Rotulo ſupradicto.

Examinatur per

RICHARDUM BROUGHTON,

There cannot be a clearer proofe in the world, to prove that Arch-Bishop *Parker* was neither confirmed nor Conſecrated upon the ſixth of *December* Anno 1559. and

and that he was both Confirmed and Consecrated, and commanded to Consecrate others, upon the eighteenth of the same moneth. Neither doth the King, or Church, or Lawes of *England*, take notice of any man as a true Arch-Bishop or Bishop, untill hands be imposed upon him, but alwaies with this addition [*Elect*] as in the booke of Ordination, *Ego I N. Ecclesiæ atque sedis N. Electus Episcopus profiteor.* And in the letany, *Te Rogamus ut hunc fratrem nostrum Electo Episcopo Benedictionem & gratiam tuam largiri digneris.*

Lastly, by the lawes of *England*, a Bishop can not be admitted to do his homage or sweare fealty for his Bishoprick, nor be restored to his Temporalties, untill he be legally Consecrated: But it is Apparent by the Queenes Letters Patents, dated the one and twentieth day of *March* following, (that was at the end of Hilary terme, as speedily as could be) he had done his homage, and was then restored to his Temporalties. Which proveth clearly, that he was legally Consecrated, that is to say, according to the Register. Such a perpetuall agreement there is, between our Ecclesiasticall-Recordes and our Civill Recordes.

CHAP.

CHAPT. V.

The eighth ninth and tenth reasons against that fabulous relation, from the Authority of our Statute, the booke of the lifes of the Arch-Bishops of Canterbury, and all sorts of witnesses.

The eighth reason.

THe eighth reason to prove the *Nagges-head* Ordinatiõ to be a fable, is takẽ frõ the authority of the Statute in the eighth yeare of Queene *Elisabeth*, which is thus entituled. *An Act declaring the manner of making and Consecrating of the Arch-Bishops and Bishops of this Realme, to be good lawfull and perfect.* [*An Act declaring*] not enacting or making; [the *manner of making and Consecrating the Arch Bishops and Bishops of this Realme,*] that is, those in the beginning of Queene *Elisabeths* time, as appeareth by the whole body of the Act; [*to be good lawfull and perfect.* The title of the Statute alone is sufficient to confute this fable: But there is much more in the body of the Statute; As where it *approveth the making and consecrating of the same Arch Bishops and Bishops*

shops to be duely and orderly done, according to the lawes of this Realme. If it was done duely and orderly according to the lawes of this Realme, then it was not done at the *Nagges head*, nor after such a silly ridiculous manner, as these Fathers do relate it. That forme differeth from our forme in all things. In the Consecrater, or Minister of the Consecration: We must have three Bishops at the least, there was but one. In the matter: Our matter is Imposition of handes, their matter was the laying the Bible upon the head or shoulders of the person Consecrated. In the forme: Our forme is *receive the holy Ghost* &c, Their forme was, *Take thou Authority to preach the word of God sincerely.*

The Statute proceedeth, that *they were elected made and consecrated Arch Bishops and Bishops, according to such order and forme, and with such Ceremonies in and about their Consecrations, as were allowed and set forth by the said Acts Statutes and Orders, annexed to the said booke of Common praier before mentioned.* This is plaine enough. If the Parliament say truely, then they were

were Consecrated in a Church, not in a Taverne; not according to the Brainsick whimsies of a self conceited Foole, or rather the ludibrious devise of an Archenemy, but according to the forme prescribed by the Church and Kingdome. The Parliament had more reason to know the truth then these Fathers, for there were personally present both the persons who did consecrate, and the persons who were consecrated, and many Lords and Gentlemen who were eye witnesses of the consecration. Chuse Reader, whether thou wilt trust the tale of a single, obscure, malicious spie, tatling in a corner: or the asseveration of the Parliament of England, in the face of the sun, published to the world in print.

The Parliament testifieth further, that it is and may be very evident and apparent that *no cause of scruple ambiguity or doubt can or may justly be objected, against the said Elections Confirmations or Consecrations*. Do they thinke the Parliament would have given such a testimony for the Nagges head Consecrations. And so they conclude, that *all persons which had been or should be ordered or consecrated, after the forme and order prescribed* in the said English Ordinall, were

ery deed, and by authority of Parliament were declared and enacted to be rightly Ordered and Consecrated. The scope of the Parliament ed of this Act, was to confirme the conse-ration of Arch Bishop *Parker* and the rest of the Bishops, and to free them from ca-ills and objections: But they confirme o Ordination at the *Nagges head*, nei-ther can their words be extended any way o such a ridiculous Consecration: There-fore the Ordination of Arch Bishop *Parker* nd the rest, was no *Nagges head* Ordinatiõ.

My ninth reason to prove that *Nagges-ead* Relation fabulous and counterfeit, s taken from the Testimony of that book ormerly mentioned, of the lifes of the se-enty Arch Bishops of *Canterbury*; whe-ein the Consecrations of Arch Bishop *Parker* and all the rest are particulary re-ated. That which was published to the orld in print, above thirty yeares be-ore the death of Queene Elisabeth, was ot lately forged: But the legall Ordi-nations of Arch-Bishop *Parker* and the est, according to the Register, was publi-hed to the world in print, above thirty eares before the death of Queene Elisa-eth. Againe, that which was published o the world in print with the allowance

of

of Arch Bishop *Parker*, or rather by Arch Bishops *Parker* himself, was not intended by Arch Bishop *Parker* to be smothered or concealed. Men do not use to publish their forgeries in print; especially so soone, and of such publick actions, whilest there are so many eye witnesses living. That the Relation was not confuted, That the Authour was never called to an account for it, That no man stood up against the Registers; nor on the behalf of the *Nags head* Ordination in those daies, That Mr *Neale* was so tame to endure the lie in print and all his party so silent, at that time when the truth might so easily have been discovered, as if it had bene written with the beame of the sun, (as it was indeed); is not evident proofe that our Relation is undeniable, and the Relation which the Fathers make is but a drowsy dreame which could not indure the light of the sun.

The tenth reason. The tenth and last reason to prove our Relation true and theirs fabulous, is taken from all sortes of witnesses, ours and theirs indifferently. Mr *Mason* reckoneth up seven of our writers, who had just

ed the legality of our Ordinations, and ited our Regiſters as authentick Recor-es, before himſelf; Bishop *Iewell*, ishop *Hall*, Bishop *Goodwin*, Doctor ollings, Mr, *Camden*, Mr. *Shelden*, d one who was then living when this ueſtion was ſo hotely debated in King mes his time, and had been an eye-wit-eſſe of Arch Bishop *Parkers* Conſecra-ons at *Lambeth*, that was the *Earle* of ottingham. One that was, well ſtored ith our English writers in Queene *liſabeths* time, might adde many more: t that can not well be expected from me this diſtance.

We may produce as many of theirs, ho have confeſſed or been convinced of e truth of Arch Bishop *Parkers* Conſe-ation. Firſt Mr. *Clerke*, whoſe Father s Regiſter to Cardinall *Pole* in his Le-antine Courte, and he himſelf an Actu-y under him, when *Theophilus Higgins* d out of England to *St. Omars*, or *way*, (I remember not well whether). ere he met with this Mr. *Clerke*, o falling into diſcourſe with him ncerning his Reaſons why he had

had forſaken the Church of England, M
Higgins told him, that one of them, w
that ſaying of St. *Hierome*, *It is no Ch*
which hath no Prieſts; reflecting upon t
Nagges head Conſecration. Mr. *Clerke*
proved well of his Caution, becauſe
dubiis tutior pars ſequenda: but withall
wished, that what their Authours had wr
ten concerning that point, could be ma
good; confeſſing that he himſelf was
England at that time, (The witneſſe d
not poſitively remember whether at t
Conſecration or not.) But Mr, *Cler*
ſaid that he himſelf was preſent when
Advocate of the Arches, whom the Quee
ſent to peruſe the Regiſter after the Co
ſecration, and to give her an account wh
ther it was performed Canonically, return
her this anſwer, that *he had peru*
the Regiſter, and that no juſt except
could be made againſt the Conſecrati
But (he ſaid) *ſomething might ha*
been better, particularly that Bi
Coverdale was not in his Rochet, B
he aſſured her, *that could make no*
fect in the Conſecration. Here w
have, if not an eye witneſſe, yet at leaſt
eare witneſſe in an undoubted manner, of

leg

legall Consecration, and of the truth of the Regiſter, and of the judgement of the Advocate of the Arches, concerning the Canonicalneſſe of the Conſecration. Thus much *Mr. Higgins* was ready to make faith of whileſt he was living, and *Mr. Barwick* a perſon of very good credit, from him of at this preſent.

The ſecond witneſſe is *Mr. Higgins* himſelf, who comming afterwards into England had a deſire to ſee the Regiſter, and did ſee it, and finding thoſe expreſſe words in it [*Milo vero Coverdallus non niſi toga lanea talari utebatur*,] and remembring withall what *Mr. Clerke* had told him, whereas the Canonicall garments of the reſt of the Biſhops are particularly deſcribed: he was ſo fully ſatisfied of the truth of the Conſecration, and lawfull ſucceſſion of our Engliſh Biſhops, that he ſaid he never made doubt of it afterwards.

My third witneſſe is *Mr. Hart*, a ſtiffe Roman Catholick, but a very ingenuous perſon, who having ſeene undoubted copies of Doctor *Reynolds* his Ordination by Biſhop *Freake*, and of Biſhop *Freakes* Conſecration by ArchBiſhop *Parker*, and laſtly of ArchBiſhop *Parkers* owne Conſecration: he was ſo fully ſatisfied with it, that he himſelf

selfe did raſe out all that part of the confe-
rence betweene him and Doctor *Reinolds*.

My fourth witneſſe is Father *Oldcorne* the Ieſuit. This teſtimony was urged by me in my treatiſe of Schiſme in theſe words. *Theſe authentick evidences being upon occaſion produced, out of our Eccleſiaſti-call Courtes, and deliberately peruſed and viewed by Father Oldcorne the Ieſuit, he both confeſſed himſelf clearly convinced of that whereof he had ſo long doubted, (that was the legitimate ſucceſſion of Biſhops and Prieſts in our Church) and wiſhed heartily towards the reparation of the breach of Chriſtendome, that all the world were ſo abundantly ſatisfied as he himſelf was; blaming us as partly guilty of the groſſe miſtake of many, for not having publickly and timely made knowne to the world, the notorious falſhood of that empty, but farre ſpread aſperſion againſt our ſucceſſion.* To this the Biſhop of *Chalcedon*, who was better acquainted with the paſſages of thoſe times in England, then any of thoſe perſons whom theſe Fa-

thers stile of *undoubted credit*, makes this confession. *That father Oldcorne being in hold for the powder treason, and judging others by himself, should say, those Registers to be authentick, is no marvell,* Survey c. 9. p. 122.

A fifth witnesse is Mr. Wadsworth, who in an Epistle to a freind in England doth testifie, that *before he left England he read the Consecration of Arch Bishop Parker in our Registers.* This made him so moderate above his fellowes, that whereas some of them tell of five, and the most of them of fifteen, which were consecrated at the Nagges head, he saith onely that *the consecration of the first Protestant Bishop was attempted there, but not accomplished.* If it were onely attempted not accomplished, then the *Nagges head* Ordination is a fable. But it falleth out very unfortunately for Mr *Wadsworths* attempt, that of all those first Protestant Bishops, whose elections were all confirmed at *Bowes* Church about that time, (And it might be all of them, it is very probable fundry of them had a confirmation dinner at the Nagges head) not one was confirmed in person, but all of them by their Proxies: Arch Bishop *Parker* by Doctor *Bullingham*, Bishop In Ep. ad ami. n. 5.

Barlow and Bishop *Scory* by *Walter Ions* Bachelour of Law, Bishop *Grindall* by *Thomas Hink* Doctor of Law, Bishop *Cox* by *Edward Gascoine*, Bishop *Sands* by *Thomas Bentham*, *&c*; as appeareth by the authentick Recordes of their confirmation. Bishops are ordinarily confirmed by Proxie, but no man was ever consecrated, no man was ever attempted to be consecrated by Proxie.

The four next witnesses are Mr. *Collimor*, *Mr. Laithwait*, *Mr. Faircloth*, *and Mr. Leake*, two of them of the same order with these Fathers; to whom the Arch Bishop of *Canterbury* caused these Recordes to be shewed, in the presence of himself, the Bishops of *London*, *Durham*, *Ely*, *Bath* and *Welles*, *Lincolne*, and *Rochester*. They viewed the Register, they turned it over and over, and perused it as much as they pleased, and in Conclusion gave this sentence of it, that *the booke was beyond exception*. To say, that afterwards they desired to have the Recordes into prison, to peruse them more fully, is ridiculous. Such Recordes may not goe out of the presence of the Keeper. But these Fathers may see them as much as they list in the Registrie, if they seeke for satisfaction, not altercation.

Lastly

Lastly Bishop *Bonner* had a suite with Bishop *Horne*, and the issue was whether Bishop *Horne* were legally consecrated Bishop; upon that scruple, or rather cavill, which I have formerly mentioned. If Mr. *Neale* who they say was Bishop *Bonners* Chaplein, and sent on purpose to spie what the Bishops did, could have proved the ordination of Bishop *Horne* at the *Nagges head*, he might not onely have cleared his Master, but have turned Bishop *Horne* deservedly out of his Bishoprick. But he was loath to forfeit his eares, by avouching such a palpaple lie. The *Nagges head* Ordination was not talked of in those daies. How should it, before it was first devised? *Mr. Sanders* dedicated a booke to ArchBishop *Parker*, which he called *the Rock of the Church*: If the Nagges head Ordination had bene a serious truth, how would he have triumphed over the poore Arch-Bishop?

To conclude, If faith ought to be given to concurring Recordes Ecclesiasticall and civill, of the Church and Kingdome of *England*, If a full Parliament of the whole Kingdome deserve any credit, If the testimony of the most eminent publick Notaries in the Kingdome, If witnesses without

exception, If the silence, or contradiction, or confession of knowne Adversaries, be of any force, If the strongest presumtions in the world may have any place, that men in their right wittes will not ruine themselves willfully, without necessity, or hope of advantage, If all these grounds put together do over ballance the clandestine Relation of a single malicious Spie, without either oath, or any other obligation: then I hope every one who readeth these grounds will conclude with me, that the Register of the Church of England is beyond all exception, and the malicious Relation of the *Nagges head* Ordination, a very tale of a tub, and no better; so full of Ridiculous folly in it self, that I wonder how any prudent man can relate it without laughter.

Who told this to *Bluet*? *Neale*. Who told this to *Haberley*? *Neale*. Who told it to the rest of the Prisoners at *Wisbich*? *Neale*. Onely *Neale*. Who suggested it to *Neale*? The Father of lies. *Neale* made the fable, *Neale* related it in Corners, long after the time it was pretended to be acted. If his Maister Bishop Bonner had knowne any thing of it, we had heard of it long before. That the Arch-Bishop should leave Lambeth

beth to come to London to be consecrated; That he should leave all those Churches in London, which are immediately under his owne Iurisdiction, to chuse a common taverne, as the fittest place for such a worke; That Bishop Bonner being deprived of his Bishoprick, and a prisoner in London, should send Neale from Oxford, and send a command by him to one over whom he never had any Iurisdiction; That the other Bishop being then a Protestant should obey him being a Roman Catholick, when there were so many Churches in the City to performe that worke in, where the Bishop of London never pretended any Iurisdiction; That these things should be treated, and concluded, and executed all at one meeting; that Bishop Bonner did foresee it would be so, And command his servant to attend there untill he see the end of that businesse. That the Bishops being about such a Clandestine worke, should suffer a knowne enemy to stay all the while in their company, is incredible. If *Neale* had feined that he had heard it from one of the Drawers boies, it had deserved more credit, then this silly, improbable

inconsistent Relation; which looketh more like an heape of fictions made by severall Authours by starts, then a continued Relation of one man,

Quicquid ostendas mihi sic incredulus odi.

CHAPT. VI.

The Naggs head Ordination is but a late devise. Of the Earle of Nottingham, Bishop Bancroft, Doctor Stapleton, the Statute 8. El. 1. And the Queenes dispensation.

NOw having laid our grounds, in the next place let us see what the Fathers have to say further for themselves. *This story of the* Naggs head *was first contradicted by* Mason *in the yeare* 1613: *yet so weakly and faintly that the attentive Reader may easily perceive he feared to be caught in a lie.* First, the Fathers seem to argue after this manner; Many Athenian writers did mention the Cretan Bulls and Minotaurs and Labyrinth, but no Cretan did write against them, therefore those ridiculous Fables were true. Rather, the Cretans laughed at

at their womannish revenge, to thinke to repaire themselves for a beating, with scolding and lying: such ridiculous Fictions ought to be entertained with scorne and contempt, *Spreta exolescunt, si irascaris agnita videntur.* Secondly, it might be (for any thing I know to the contrary) Mr. *Mason* was the first who dissected this lie, and laid the falsity of it open to the world: but he was not the first who avouched and justified the Canonicall Consecration, and personall Succession of our Protestant Bishops, which is the same thing in effect; the Bishop of *Hereford* did it before him, and Doctor *Reynolds* before the Bishop of *Hereford*, and he that writ the life of Arch-Bishop *Parker* before Doctor *Reynolds*, and the Parliament before him that writ Arch Bishop *Parkers* life, and the publick Registers of the Church before the Parliament.

Thirdly, they would make us believe that this Fable was ancient, and published to the world from the beginning of Queen *Elisabeths* time in print, and unanswered by the Protestants untill the 13. of King *Iames*: but there is no such thing. For their credit, let them produce one Authour that mentioneth it in the beginning of

Queen *Elisabeths* time, or if they cannot doe that, for forty yeares after, that is, before the yeare 1600: or otherwise the case is plain that it is an upstart lie, newly coined about the beginning of King *Iames* his time; the Fathers would not have us answer it before it was coined, or before it was known to us.

Where they say that Mr, *Mason* did handle this Controversy *weakly and faintly*, they know they doe him wrong: He hath so thrashed their Authours, *Fusherbert*, and *Fitz-Simon*, and *Holywood*, and *Constable*, and *Kellison*, and *Champney*, that the cause hath wanted a Champion ever since, untill these Fathers tooke up the Bucklers. But whereas they adde, that *Mr. Mason was affraid to be convinced by some aged persons that might then be living, and remember what passed in the beginning of Queen* Elisabeths *reign*; is so farre from truth, that *Mr. Mason* nameth a witnesse beyond all exception, that was invited to ArchBishop *Parkers* Consecration at *Lambeth*, as being his Kinsman, and was present there, The Earle of *Nottingham* Lord High Admirall of *England*.

Why

Why did none of their Authors goe to him, or imploy ſome of their Friends to inquire of him? The caſe is cleare, they were more affraid of Conviction, and to be caught in a lie, then *Mr. Maſon*: who laid not the Foundation of his Diſcourſe upon looſe prittle-prattle, but upon the Firm Foundation of Originall Records.

They ſay, *in the yeare 1603, none of the Proteſtant Clergy durſt call it a fable, as ſome now doe.* I am the man, I did call it ſo, I do call it ſo. Such a blind relation as this is, of a buſineſſe pretended to be acted in the yeare 1559, being of ſuch conſequence, as whereupon the ſucceſſion of the Church of *England* did depend, and never publiſhed untill after the yeare 1600, as if the Church of England had neither Friends nor Enemies; deſerveth to be ſtiled *a Tale of a Tub* and no better.

They adde, Bancroft *Bishop of London being demanded by Mr. William Alabaſter, how Parker and his Collegues were conſecrated Bishops? anſwered, he hoped that in Caſe of neceſſity a Prieſt (alluding to Scory, might*

might ordein Bishops. This answer of his was objected in Print by Holywood, *against him and all the English Clergy in the yeare* 1603. *not a word replied*, Bancroft *himself being then living.* And why might not *Holywood* be misinformed of the Bishop of *London*, as well as you yourselves were misinformed of the Bishop of *Durham*? This is certain he could not allude to Bishop *Scory*, who was consecrated a Bishop in the reigne of *Edward* the sixth, as by the Records of those times appeareth; unlesse you have a mind to accuse all Records of Forgery. If you have any thing to say against Bishop *Scoryes* Consecration, or of any of them who joined in Ordeining Arch Bishop *Parker*, spare it not, we wil not seek help of an Act of Parliament to make it good.

In summe, I doe not believe a word of what is said of Bishop *Bancroft*, *sub modo* as it is here set down, nor that this Accusation did ever come to the knowledge of that prudent Prelate; if it did, he had greater matters to trouble his head withall, than Mr. *Holywords* bables: but if ever such a question was proposed to him, it may be after a clear answer to the matter of Fact

he might urge this as *argumentum ad hominem*; that though both Bishop *Scory* and Bishop *Coverdale* had been but simple Priests, (as they were complete Bishops), yet joining with Bishop *Barlow* and Bishop *Hodgskings*, two undoubted Bishops (otherwise *Gardiner* and *Bonner* and *Tunstall* and *Thurleby* and the rest were no Bishops,) the Ordination was as Canonicall, as for one Bishop and two Mitred Abbats to consecrate a Bishop (which you allow in case of Necessity), or one Bishop and two simple Presbyters to consecrate a *Bishop* by Papall Dispensation. So this question will not concern us at all, but them very much, to reconcile themselves to themselves. They teach that the matter and form of Ordination are essentialls of Christs own Institution, They teach that it is grievous Sacrilege to change the matter of this Sacrament, They teach that the matter of Episcopall Ordination is Imposition of hands of three Bishops, upon the person consecrated: and yet with them one Bishop and two Abbats, or one Bishop and two simple Priests extraordinarily by Papall dispensation, may ordein Bishops. The essentialls of Sacraments doe consist *in indivisibili*, once Essen-

tiall

tiall alwaies Essentiall, whether ordinarily, or extraordinarily whether with dispensation or without. So this Question whether a Priest in case of Necessity may ordein Bishops, doth concern them much, but us not at all. But for my part I believe the whole Relation is feined, for so much as concerneth Bishop *Bancroft*.

They adde, or the one of them, *I have spoken with both Catholicks and Protestants, that remember neare 80. yeares, and acknowledge that so long they have heard the* Nagges head *story related as an undoubted truth.* Where I wonder? sooner in *Rome* or *Rhemes* or *Doway*, then in *England*, and sooner in a Corner then upon the Exchange. You have heard from good Authors of the Swans singing, and the Pellicans pricking of her Breast with her bill: but you are wiser then to believe such groundlesse Fictions. I produce you seven of the ancient Bishops of England, some of them neare an 100. yeares old, who doe testify that it is a *groundlesse Fable*: yet they have more reason to know the right value of our Ecclesiasticall Records, and the truth of our affaires

affaires, then any whom you converſe withall:

The Authours proceed, *This Narration of the Conſecration at the* Nagges head, *have I taken out of* Holywood, Conſtable, *and Doctor* Champnies *vvorkes.* They heard it from many *of the ancient Clergy, vvho vvere Priſoners for the Catholick Religion in* Wyſbich *Caſtle*, as Mr. Blewet, Doctor Watſon, *Bishop of* Lincoln, *and others. Theſe had it from the ſaid Mr.* Neale *and other Catholicks preſent at* Parkers *Conſecration in the* Nagges head, *as Mr.* Conſtable *affirmes* Here is nothing but hearſay, upon hearſay, ſuch Evidence would not paſſe at a tryall for a lock of Goats wooll. *Holywood* aud the reſt had it from ſome of the *Wiſbich* Priſoners: and the *Wiſbich* Priſoners heard it from Mr. *Neale* and others.

What others? had they no names? did Bishop *Bonner* ſend more of his Chapleins then one to be Spectators of the Conſecration, and they who were to be conſe-

consecrated permit them being Adversaries to continue among them, during the Consecration, supposed to be a Clandestine Action. It is not credible, without a Plot between *Neale* and the Host of the *Naggs-head*, to put him and his fellowes for that day into Drawers habits, least the Bishops should discover them. Here, is enough said to disgrace this Narration for ever, that the first Authors that published it to the world, did it after the yeare 1600 untill then it was kept close in Lavander. Bishop *Watson* lived splendidly with the Bishops of *Ely* and *Rochester*, at the time of Arch-Bishop *Parkers* Consecration, and a long time after, before he was removed to *Wisbich* Castle. If there had been any such thing really acted, and so notoriously known, as they pretend, Bishop *Watson* and the other Prisoners, must needs have known it long before that time, when Mr. *Neale* is supposed to have brought them the first newes of it. The whole story composed of Inconsistences. That which quite spoileth their story, is that Arch Bishop *Parker* was never present at any of these Consecrations, otherwise called Confirmation Dinners: but it may be the merry Host shewed Mr. *Neale* Doct. *Bullingh*

Bullingham for Arch Bishop *Parker*, and told him what was done in the withdrawing roome, which (to gaine more credit to his Relation) he feigned that he had seen, out of pure zeale.

Howsoever, they say *the Story was divulged to the great griefe of the newly Consecrated, yet being so evident a truth they durst not contradict it.* We must suppose that these Fathers have a Privilege to know other mēs hearts, but let that passe. Let them tell us how it was divulged by word or writing, when and where it was divulged whilest they were newly consecrated, who divulged it and to whom? If they can tell us none of all this, it may passe for a great presumption, but it cannot passe for a proofe.

But they say, that *not onely the Nullity of the Consecration, but also the illegality of the same was objected in Print against them not long after, by that famous writer Doctor* Stapleton *and others.* We looke upon Doctor *Stapleton*, as one of the most Rationall heads that your Church hath had since the sepe-ration: but speake to the purpose Fathers, did Doctor *Stapleton* print one word of the *Nagges head* Consecration. You may be sure he would not have balked it, if there had been any such thing, but he did balke

it

it because there was no such thing. No, no, Doctr. *Stapletons* pretended illegality was upon another ground, because he dreamed that King *Edwards* Statute was repealed by Queen *Mary*, and not restored by Queen *Elisabeth*, for which we have an expresse Act of Parliament against him in the point: and his supposed invalidity was because they were not consecrated *ritu Romano*. If you think Doctor *Stapleton* hath said any thing that is materiall, to prove the invalidity or nullity of our Consecration, take your bowes and arrowes and shoote over his shafts againe, and try if you do not meet with satisfactory answers, both for the Institution of Christ, and the Canons of the Catholick Church, and the Lawes of *England*.

You say, *Parker and the rest of the Protestant Bishops, not being able to answer the Catholick arguments against the invalidity of their Ordination* &c. Words are but wind. The Church of *England* wanted not Orthodox Sonnes enough to cope with *Stapleton* and all the rest of your Emissaries: nor *to cry down the illegall and extravagant manner of it at the Nagges head.* How should they cry down, that which never had been cryed up in those daies? We condemne, that which

form of Ordination which you feign to have beē uſed at the *Nagges head*, as *illegall*, and *extravagant*, and (which weigheth more then both of them) invalid, as much as yourſelves.

They *were forced to begge an act of Parliament, whereby they might enjoy the Temporalties, not withſtanding the known defects of their Conſecration &c.* O Ingenuity! whither art thou Fled out of the world? Say, where is this Petition to be found, in the Records of *Eutopia*? Did the Parliament ever make any ſuch eſtablishment of their Temporalties, more then of their Spiritualties? Did the Parliament ever take any notice of any Defects of their Conſecration? Nay, did not the Parliament declare their Conſecration to have been free from all defects? Nay, doth not the Parliament quite contrary, brand theſe Reports for *ſlanderous ſpeeches*, and juſtify their Conſecrations to have *been duely and orderly done, according to the Lawes of this Realm*: and that *it is very evident and apparent, that no cauſe of ſcruple ambiguity or doubt, can be juſtly objected* againſt their Elections Confirmations or Conſecrations. 8. *Eliſ.* cap. 1.

Yet they give a reaſon of what they ſay, *for albeit* Edward *the ſixths rite of Ordination was reeſtablished by Act of*

Parliament in the first yeare of Queen Elisabeth: *yet it was notorious that the Ordination at the* Nagges head *was very different from it, and formed* extempore *by* Scoryes *Puritanicall Spirit &c.* I take that which you grant out of *Sanders*, that King *Edwards* Form of Ordination, was reesstablished by Act of Parliament 1. *Elisabethæ*; wherein you doe unwittinghly condemne both Bishop *Bonners* and *Stapletons* plea of illegality. The rest which you say is partly true and partly false. It is very true that there is great difference between the English Form of Ordeining, and your *Nagges head* Ordination, as much as is between the head of a living horse and the sign of the *Nagges head*, or between that which hath a reall entity and an imaginary *Chimæra* (*Mr. Mason* was the *Bellerephon* that destroyed this monster): But that the Form of the *Nagges head* Ordination was framed *extempore* by *Scoryes Puritanicall Spirit*, is most false; That *Posthumus* brat was the *Minerva* or Issue of Mr. *Neales* brain, or some others who fathered this rapping lie upon him.

Then they repeat the words of a part of the Statute, and thence conclude, *By which Act appeares that not onely King* Edwards

rite, but any other used since the beginning of the Queeens reign, upon her Commission was enacted for good, and consequently that of the Nagges head might passe. Cujus cõtrarium verum est. The Contrary to what these Fathers inferre, doth follow necessarily from these words which the Fathers cite. The words of the Act are these, [*By virtue of the Queens Letters Patents or Commission*]: Every one of the Letters Patents is extant in the Rolles; not one of them did ever authorise any form but that which was legally established; that is, the Form of *Edward* the sixth. First, the Queens Letters Patents or Commission hath an *aut minus* in it, *or at the least three or foure of you*: but to justify the *Nagges head* Ordination, the *aut minus* must be altered to *at the least* one or two of you. Secondly, the Queens Letters Patents have alwaies this clause in them: *Iuxta Formam & effectum Statutorum in ea parte editorum & provisorum*; *According to the form and effect of the Statutes in that case made and provided*: but the Statutes allow no lesse number then four, or at the least three to ordein, At the *Nagges head* (you say there was but one

Ordeiner. Our Statutes preſcribe *Impoſition of Hands* as the Eſſentiall matter of Ordination, and theſe words, *Receive the Holy Ghoſt* as the form of Ordination: but your *Nagges head* Ordination is a mere Phantaſm, without matter or Forme; our Statutes allow no ſuch fanaticall and Phantaſticall Formes, as your Form of the *Nagges head*. And ſo your Conſequence, [*Conſequently that of the Nagges head might paſſe*], is foundered of all four, and can neither paſſe nor repaſſe, unleſſe you can raſe theſe words [*by virtue of the Queens Letters Patents*] out of the Statute, and inſert theſe [*without the Queens Letters Patents*]: and likewiſe raſe theſe words out of the Commiſſion [*according to the Form and effect of the Statutes*], and inſert theſe [*contrary to the Form and effect of the Statutes*]. A ſingle Falſification will doe your cauſe no good. Two poiſons may perchance help it at a dead lift.

It is in vain to tell us, that Mr *Maſon ſee this over clear to be denied*, who know better that Mr. *Maſon* did not onely deny it over and over again, but ſqeeſed the poore Fable to durt. I have ſhewed you particularly what was the end of the Queens Diſpenſations, the

the ſame which is the end of Papall Diſpenſations, to meet with latent objections or cavills. I have ſhewed you what that Cavill was; which needed no Diſpenſation in point of Law, but onely to ſtop the mouths of Gainſaiers. But where you adde, that *the Queens Diſpenſation was given, not in conditionall but in very abſolute Termes*: You are abſolutely miſtaken. The Queens diſpenſation was both in Generall Termes, which determin nothing, (not like the Popes Diſpenſations, *A quibuſvis excommunicationis ſuſpenſionis & interdicti ſententiis*): and alſo in theſe conditionall Terms, *ſi quid &c. deſit aut deerit eorum quæ per Statuta hujus regni noſtri, aut per leges Eccleſiaſticas in hac parte requiruntur*: *If any thing is or ſhall be wanting, which are required by the Lawes Civill or Eccleſiaſticall of this Kingdome.* You ſee it is conditionall and hath reference onely to the Lawes of *England*.

They goe on, *the truth is, all the world laughed at the* Nagges head *Conſecration, and held it to be invalid, not ſo much for being performed in a Tavern, as for the new form invented by* Scory.

If all the world did laugh at it in those dayes, they laughed in their sleeves, where no body could see them laugh. It had been too much to laugh at a jeast before it was made, nay before it was devised. The Reader may well wonder, how *all the world* came to get notice of it so early as the beginning of Queen *Elizabeths* reign, and we onely in *England* should heare nothing of it for above 40 yeares after? but assoone as we did heare of it, we laught at it as well as they, and held it as invalid as they could doe for their hearts; but they laught at it as Bishop *Scoryes* Invention, and we laught at it as theirs.

CAP. VII.

Of Bishop Bonner, the Reordination of our Clergy, the quality of their witnesses, Mr. Fitzherberts suspicions, the testimony of their Doctors, and the Publishing of our Register before Mr. Mason

Their next instance is in Bishop *Bonners* case, who *was indited by Mr.* Horn, *one* of

of the First Protestant Bishops consecrated by Mr. Parker, *or together with him, for refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy.* The first errour might be pardoned, as being onely a mistake in a word, to say that Bishop *Bonner* was *indited* by Mr. *Horn*, where as he was onely signified by Bishop Horn: but the second mistake is fatall, that after all this confidence, and this great Notoreity of the *Nagges head* Ordination *to all the world*, these Fathers themselves are still uncertain, whether Bishop Horn *were consecrated by Archbishop* Parker, *or at the same time with him*; that is as much as to say, they know not certainly what was done at the *Nagges head*, but they wish that if the Confirmation dinner were not a Consecration, it had been one. It could never end better, for Mr. *Neale* to feign an Ordination, without an Actuary to record what was done. *Bishop Watson* and Mr. *Bluet* and the rest were much to blame, that (since he had the fortune to weare *Gyges* his ring and walk invisible) they did not cause him to play the publick Notary himself, and draw that which was done there into Acts; then we might have known as certainly as he could tell us, whether *Dr. Parker* had been consecrated there by his

Proctor Dr *Bullingham*. It may be, some very credulous Reader, who like the old *Lamia*, could take out his eyes and put them in again when he pleased, would have given more credit to Mr *Neales* pleasant Fable, then to the publick Rolles and Registers of the Kingdome.

I have handled Bishop *Bonners* case before: and these Fathers themselves have unwittingly given sentence in it against him; That *King* Edwards *Forme of Ordination, Was reestablished by Act of Parliamant in the first yeare of Queen* Elisabeth. But finall sentence there was never any given, untill the Parliament gave a finall sentence in it, That Bishop *Horn* and all the rest were legall Bishops. To admit a Plea to be tryed by a Iury, and the veredict of the Iury, are two very distinct things.

They tell us, *he was a man specially shot at*. Rather he was a man graciously preserved by the Queens mercy, from the rage of the Common people against him. If they had *shot at* him, they could have found waies enough to have tendered the Oath of Supremacy to him, without Bishop

shop *Horn.* I profeſſe I am no great Patron of ſuch Oaths, men have more dominion over their actions then over their judgements: Yet there is leſſe to be ſaid for Bishop *Bonner*, then for other men. He who had ſo great a hand in framing the Oath, He who had taken it himſelf, both in *King Henryes* time, and King *Edwards* time, and made ſo many others to take it, He who had been ſo great a ſtickler in *Rome* for the Kings Supremacy, who writ that Preface before Bishop *Gardiners* booke *de vera Obedientia*: if he had ſuffered by the Oath of Supremacy, he had but been ſcourged with a rod of his own making.

Their next reaſon to prove the Nullity of our Holy Orders, is taken from *the conſtant Practice of the Romane Catholicks, to Reordein Proteſtant Miniſters, not conditionally but abſolutely*, which they call *an evident Argument of our mere Laity.* A doughty Argument indeed, drawn from their own Autho-

Authority. Can any man doubt, that that they which make no ſcruple of taking away our lifes, will make conſcience of taking away our Orders? This is that which we accuſe them of, and they doe fairly begge the Queſtion. If Reordination be Sacrilege (as they ſay it is), we are ready to convince them of groſſe Sacrilege, or iterating all the Eſſentialls of Ordination, the ſame matter and the ſame Form that is for Epiſcopacy, the ſame Impoſition of Hands by three Bishops, and the ſame words *Receive the Holy Ghoſt* &c. Some were of the ſame mind with theſe Fathers in Queen *Maries* time: but *Paul* the 4. and Cardinall *Poole* were wiſer, who confirmed all Ordinations in *Edward* the ſixths time indifferently, ſo the Perſons profeſſed but their Conformity to the Roman Religion. How doth this conſiſt with your pretended Nullity?

They ſay, *Our Records were produced by Mr:* Maſon *in the yeares* 1613, *fifty yeares after they ought to have been shewed.* They forget that they were published in Print in Arch Bishop *Parkers* lifetime, that they were juſtified by the Parliament 8. *Eliſabethæ*, that all of them goe hand in hand with our Civill Records,

H

He ſaith, *it cannot be teſtified by any lawfull witneſſes* (produced by us) *that they were not forged.* This is their Method, firſt to accuſe us of Forgery, and then to put us to prove a Negative; where learnt he this form of proceding? By all Lawes of God and man the Accuſer is to make good his Accuſation: yet we have given him witneſſes beyond exception. They ſay, *there can not be a more evident mark of Forgery, then the concealment of Regiſters, if they unſefull and neceſſary to the perſons in whoſe Cuſtody they are.* The proofe lieth on the other hand. Tell us how they were concealed, which were published to the world in Print, by a whole Parliament, by private perſons, and were evermore left in a Publick Office, where all the world might view them from time to time, who had either occaſion or deſire to doe it? That our Adverſaries did *inſult and Triumph over us,* is but un empty flourish without truth or reality, as we shall ſee preſently.

They ſay, *it is not worth refuting which ſome modern Proteſtants ſay, ye have no witneſſes of the ſtory of the* Nagges head &c. *but Roman Catholicks, we value not their Teſtimony, becauſe they are known Adverſaries.* This anſwer they term *Ridiculous*, and paralell

it

it with the answer of an Officer in *Ireland*. You will not find this answer so ridiculous, upon more serious consideration. Protestants know that some Exceptions in Law, do destroy all Credit, and some other Exceptions do onely diminish credit. An Adversaries Testimony may be admitted in some cases, but it is subject to exception and makes no full proofe, especially in cases favourable in the Law; as the case of persons spoiled, (which is your Irish case). such witnesses may be admitted, *ante omnia spoliatus restituì debet*: but then they ought to make up in number what they want in weight.

But you mistake wholy, our answer is not, that *you produce no witnesses for the story of the* Nagges head *but Roman Catholicks*: Our answer is that you produce no witnesses at all, neither Roman Catholicks nor others. For first one witnesse is no witnesse in Law, Let him be beyond exception duely sworn and examined, yet his Testimony makes but *semiplenam probationem*, half a proofe; especially in Criminall causes such as this is, it is nothing. *One witnesse shall not rise up against a*

Deut. 19. 15.

man

man for any Iniquity or any ſinne, At the mouth of two witneſſes or at the mouth of three witneſſes ſhall the matter be eſtabliſhed. Which law is confirmed by our Saviour. They were never yet able to pretend any eye witneſſe by name, bnt Mr. *Neale*, or ſome body that had no name, becauſe he had no being in the nature of things: all the reſt had it from Mr. *Neales* ſingle Teſtimony, becauſe they cannot teſtify what was done, but what Mr. *Neale* ſaid. *Mat.* 18.16.

Secondly, Mr. *Neale* teſtifieth nothing, as a ſingle witneſſe ought to teſtify. He was never ſworn to ſpeake the truth, he never teſtified it before a publick Notary, he was never examined before a competent Iudge, he was never produced before the face of a Proteſtant. Is this the mannet of the Romans now a daies, to condemne whole Churches upon the verball Teſtimony of a ſingle witneſſe, before he be brought face to face with thoſe whom he accuſeth; and ſuch a Teſtimony which is clogged with ſo many improbabilities and incongruities, and incoherences, that no rationall impartiall man can truſt one ſyllable of it? whereas

whereas in such a case as this, against the third Estate of the Kingdome, against the Records Civill and Ecclesiasticall, against the testimony of a Parliament, an hundred witnesses ought not to be admitted.

We regard not Mr. *Fitzherberts suspicions* at all. What are the suspicions of a private stranger, to the well known credit of a publick Register? His *suspicions* can weigh no more then his reasons, that is just nothing. He saith *this exception is no new quarrell, but vehemently urged to the English Clergy in the beginning of the Queens reign, to shew how and by whom they were made Priests Bishops &c*: You have said enough to confute yourselves, but you touch not us. If they had known that they were consecrated at the *Nagges head*, as well as you would seem to know it, they needed not to urge it so vehemently to shew how and by whom they were ordeined; they would have done that for them readily enough; unlesse perhaps you thinke that they concealed the *Nagges head* Ordination out of favour to the Protestants. But I see you are mistaken in this as in all other things. There was an old objection indeed, that our Consecraters were not Roman Catholiks and that our Consecration was not *Ri-*

Ro-

Romano, or that we were not Ordeined by Papall Authority: but the *Nagges head* Ordination is a new queſtion. What might be whiſpered underhand, in the eares of credulous perſons of your own party in Corners, we do not know: but for all your contrary intimations, none of all your Writers did dare to put any ſuch thing in print, for above fourty yeares after Arch Bishop *Parkers* Conſecration. If *ſilent Witneſſes in ſuch circumſtances prove more then others*, as you affirm, then all your writers are our witneſſes. But none of all your Doctors did ever urge any ſuch thing, as required that we ſhould cite the Regiſters in prudence, as by a cleare anſwer to all your Teſtimonies ſhall appeare. The water did not ſtop there in thoſe dayes: yet even in Arch Bishop *Parkers* life time the Conſecration of our Bishops was publiſhed to the world in Print; either ſhew us as much for your *Nagges head* Ordination, or hold your peace for ever. Bishop *Andrews* the learned Bishop of *Wincheſters abſurdities falſities and lies*, are eaſily talked of, men may talke of black Swans: but he who hath laid your greateſt Champions in the duſt, requires another manner of Diſcoverer then Mr. *Fitzherbert*.

But

But these Fathers are resolved to confute themselves, without the help of an Adversary. They tell us, that *no mention was ever made of Registers testifying* Parkers *Consecration at* Lambeth, *untill* Mr. Mason *printed his booke.* This is not true, they were mentioned by the Parliament, mentioned in Print, I think before Mr. *Mason* was born, What though *Lambeth* were not mentioned, if the Legality of his Consecration were mentioned? This is enough to answer your Objection; this is enough to confute your Romance of the *Nagges head.* Yet thus much you yourselves confesse, in the same Paragraph, that in a booke printed in the yeare 1605 (that is eight yeares before the yeare 1613, wherein you say that Mr, *Mason* printed his booke) called *Antiquitates Britannia*, there is *a Register of the Protestant Bishops of* England: The there was a Register of the Consecration of Protestant Bishops extant, before Mr. *Mason* did write of that subject. You say, *that Register doth not mention any certain place or Form of their Consecration.* It was not needfull; the Law prescribeth the Form, and the place was indifferent, so it were a consecrated place, which the Law doth likewise prescribe. But you tell us further, that this

R.

giſter was forged or foiſted in, and that your *learned* but nameleſſe *Friend, ſee the old Manuſcript of that booke, wherein there is no mention of any ſuch Regiſter*, which you tell us in your Friends words, that *all the world may ſee how this Regiſter was forged.* Why are all the world bound to believe your Friend? How should we give credit to a man who tells us three notorious untruths in foure lines? Firſt, that it is pretended that *Archbishop* Parker *was made a Bishop by* Barlow Scory *and three others*, by virtue of a Commiſſion from Queen *Eliſabeth*: he was made a Bishop by Barlow Scory and two others. Secondly, that this work was acted on the 17. day of September, An: 1559, which was acted on the 17. Day of December 1559. Thirdly, that *we had no form then or Order to doe ſuch a buſineſſe*; whereas you yourſelves confeſſe, that *Edward the ſixths rite of Ordination, was reeſtablished in the Firſt yeare of Queen Eliſabeth*: and Archbishop *Parkers* Ordination was in the ſecond of Queen *Eliſabeth*. He who ſtumbles ſo thick and three fold, may erre in his viewing the Manuſcript as well as the reſt. But to gratify you, ſuppoſe it was *foiſted in*, what good will that doe you? It muſt of neceſſity be foiſted in before it was printed, it could not be foiſted *pa.* 10.

in after it was printed, And it must be foisted in by a Protestant, for no Roman Catholick would foist it in. So still you see a Register of Protestant Bishops, was published to the world in print, eyght yeares before *Mr. Mason* published his booke.

Your Friend saith, that *this printed Booke of* Parkers Antiquitates Britanniæ, *is the first that mentioneth any such pretended Consecration of him and the rest.* So it might be well when it was first printed, that was not in the yeare 1605, but in Arch-Bishop *Parkers* life time, three yeares before his death, An. 1570. So much you might have learned from the very Title-page of the Booke, printed at *Hannovv*; *Historia antehac non nisi semel, nimirum Londini in Ædibus Iohannis Day anno* 1572. *excusa: That this History vvas printed formerly at* London *in the house of* Iohn Day *in the yeare* 1572. This doth utterly destroy the Credit of your Friends Relation, that he had viewed the Manuscript of that Booke. There needed no Manuscript, where they had a Printed booke for their Copy, (as the Title-page telleth us they had) : and that printed above sixty yeares before your Friend writ, it is probable before his Birth. If there be any thing of foisting

sting in the case, there is rather something foisted out of the former Edition, then foisted in; namely, Archbishop Parkers Life untill that time, with the particular Consecrations of our first Bishops, which were in the *London* Edition, and are omitted in this Edition of *Hannow*. This is cleare enough by the very Title, *An History of 70. Archbishops*, and there are in this Edition but 69. Archbishops, because the Life of Archbishop *Parker* is wanting; which nevertheless is promised in the Life of Archbishop *Warham* pag. 312. [*ut in Matthæi Parker Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi vita inferius dicemus*: *As we shall say hereafter in the Life of* Mathew Parker *Archbishop of* Canterbury. You see how infortunate you are in accusing others of Forgery.

Your Authour proceedeth, *Any man reading the printed Booke, will manifestly see it is a meerly foisted and inserted thing, having no connexion correspondence or affinity, either with that which goeth before, or followeth it.* Say you so? There was never any thing more fitly inserted. The Author undertaketh *to write* the Lifes of 70. succeeding Archbishops of Canterbury, from *Austin*

to *Matthew Parker*, and having premitted some generall Observations concerning the Antiquity of Christian Religion in *Britany*, with the names of some Arch-Bishops of *London*, and the Originall and Changes of Episcopall Sees in *England*, and some other Generalities concerning the Privileges of the See of Canterbury, and the Conversion of *Kent*; Iust before he enter upon the Life of St. *Austin* the first Archbishop, he presenteth the Reader with a summary View of the Archbishoprick of *Canterbury*, at that time when the booke was first printed, in the yeare 1572, with the names of all the Bishops of the Province at that time, their Countries, their Armes, both of their Sees and of their Families, their respective Ages, their Vniversities, their Degrees in Schooles, with the times of their severall Consecrations, if they were ordeined Bishops, or Confirmations, if they were translated from another See. It is hardly possible for the wit of man to contriue more matter into a lesser Roome. Then, he settes downe a like Table for the Province of *Yorke*: and lastly an Alphabeticall Catalogue of the Bishops whose Lifes were described in this booke, and among

mong the reſt, Archbiſhop *Parker*, whoſe Life (if you call it *foiſting*) is foiſted out of this *Hannow* Edition. If this hath *no connexion or affinity with that which goeth before, and followeth after*, I know not what Connexion or Affinity is.

Your Friends laſt Exception againſt the Authority of that booke called *Antiquitates Britannicæ*, is, that *it conteineth more things done after Matthew Parker had written that Booke.* So you confeſſe that Archbiſhop *Parker* himſelf (about whom all our controverſy is,) was the Author of that booke; wherein I agree with you. The concluſion of the Preface, and many other reaſons invite me to doe ſo. Surely this Author meant that there is ſomething conteined in this Regiſter, which is not within the Compaſſe of the following Lifes in the *Hannow* Edition, (that may well be becauſe *Matthew Parkers* life is foiſted out in this Edition:) but there is nothing which was not in the *London* Edition, much more largely then it is in this Regiſter, eſpecially for the Confirmations and Conſecrations of our Proteſtant Biſhops: there is nothing after the time when this Regiſter was made, which is prefixed in the Frontiſpice of it in the Hannow Edition, with MP for *Matthew Parker.*

Matthew Parker died May the 27, *Anno* 1575: he printed his booke at *London* three yeares before his death, without the Authours name, in the yeare 1572. I appeale to the ingenuous Reader, (let him be of what Communion he will, or never so full of prejudice), whether it be credible, that Arch Bishop *Parkers* own booke should be printed in *London*, by the Queens Printer, in his life time, and have any thing foisted into it contrary to his sense.

Here then we have a Register of Protestant Bishops, with their Confirmations and Consecrations, published to the world in Print at *London*, by Arch Bishop *Parker* himself, (who was the principall person and most concerned in that Controversy,) as if it should dare all the Adversaries of our Church to except against it, if they could. Registers cannot be concealed, being alwaies kept in the most publick and conspicuous places of great Cities, whither every one hath accesse to them who will. They need no printing, but this was printed (a work of supererogation). They who dared not to except against it then, when it was fresh in all mens memories, ought not to be admitted to make conjecturall exceptions now.

Now the Fathers come to shew, how their

their Doctors did object to our Protestant Clergy, *the Nullity and Illegality of their Ordination.* If their Doctors give a cause or reason of their knowledge, we are bound to answer that: but if they object nothing but their own Iudgement and authority, we regard it not; their judgement may weigh some thing with them, but nothing at all with us. This is not to make themselves Advocates, but Iudges over us, which we do not allow. If I should produce the Testimonies of fourscore Protestant Doctors, who affirm that we have a good Succession, or that their Succession is not good, what would they value it?

The first is Doctor *Bristow*; *Consider what Church that is, whose Ministers are but very Laymen, unsent, uncalled, unconsecrated, holding therefore amongst us when they repent and return, no other place but of Laymen, in no case admitted, no nor looking to Minister in any Office, unlesse they take Orders which before they had not.* Here is Doctor *Bristows* Determination, but where are his grounds? He bringeth none at all, but the practise of the Roman Church, and that not generall. *Paul* the 4, and Cardinall *Poole*, and the Court of Rome in those dayes were of another Iudgement, and so are many others: and so may they themselves come to be,

when they have confidered more ſeriouſly of the matter, that we have both the ſame old Eſſentialls. That which excuſeth their Reordination from formall Sacrilege (for from materiall it cannot be excuſed upon their own grounds,) is this, that they cannot diſcover the truth of the matter of Fact, for the hideous Fables raiſed by our Countrymen. But where is the *Nages head* Ordination in *Dr. Briſtow*? Then had been the time to have objected it, and printed it, if there had beē any reality in it. Either *Dr. Briſtow* had never heard of this ~~ry~~ Pageant, or he was aſhamed of it. Here we meet with *Dr. Fulke* again, ād what they ſay of him ſhall be āſwered in its proper place

Their next witneſſe is *Mr. Reinolds*, *There is no Heardman in all Turky, who doth not undertake the Government of his Heard, upon better reaſon and greater right Order and authority, then theſe your magnificent Apoſtles. &c.* And why an *Heardsman in Turky*, but onely to allude to his Title of *Calvino Turciſmus*? An heardsman in Turky hath as much right to order his heard, as an heardman in Chriſtendome; unleſſe perhaps your *Dr.* did think, that Dominiō was founded in Grace, not in nature. This is ſaying, but we expect proving. It is well known that you pretend more to a *magnificent Apoſtola-*

solate, them we. If the authority of the holy Scripture (which knoweth no other Essentialls of Ordination; but *impositiõ of hands* ād these words *Receive the Holy Ghost*,) if the perpetual practise of the universall church, if the Prescription of the ancient Councell of *Carthage*, and a bove 200. Orthodox Bishops, with the *concurrent* approbatiou of the Primitive Fathers be sufficient grounds, we want not sufficient grounds for the exercise of our Sacred Functions. But on the contrary, there is no *Heardman in Turky* who hath not more sufficient grounds or assurāce of the lawfulnesse of his Office, then you have for the discharge of your Holy Orders, upon your own grounds. The Turkish Hoardman receives his Maisters Commands without examining his intention: but according to your grounds, if in an hundred successive Ordinations, there were but one Bishop who had an intention not to Ordein, or no intention to ordein, or but one Priest who had an intētiō notto baptise, or no intention to baptise any of these Bishops, then your whole Succession cometh to nothing. But I must aske still where is your *Nagges head* Ordination in all this? Mr. *Reinolds* might have made a pleasāt Parallell between the *Nagges head* Ordination and the Ordination of the Turkish *Mufti*,

and

and wanted not a mind mischievous enough against his Mother the Church of *England*, if he could have found the least pretext: but there was none. You seek for water out of a Pumice.

Their third Witnesse is Dr. *Stapleton*, in his Counterblast against Bishop *Horn*. *To say truely, you are no Lord* Winchester, *nor elsvvhere, but onely Mr* Robert Horn. *Is it not notorious that you and your Collegues vvere not ordeined according to the prescript, I vvill not say of the Church, but even of the very Statutes? Hovv then can you challenge to your self the name of the Lord Bishop of* Winchester? *You are vvithout any Consecration at all of your Metropolitan, himself pooreman being no Bishop neither.* This was a loud blast indeed: but if *Dr Stapleton* could have said any thing of the *Nagges head* Ordination, he would have given another manner of blast, that should have made the whole world Echo again with the Sound of it. In vain you seek any thing of the *Nagges head* in your writers, untill after the yeare 1600. For answer *Dr. Stapleton* raiseth no Objection from the Institution of Christ, whereupon an

onely whereupon, the Validity or Invalidity of Ordination doth depend: but onely from the Lawes of *England*. First for the Canons, we maintein that our Form of Episcopall Ordination hath the same Essentialls with the Roman: but in other things of an inferiour allay it differeth from it. The Papall Canons were never admitted for binding Lawes in *England*, further then they were received by our selves, and incorporated into our Lawes: but our Ordination is conformable to the Canons of the Catholick Church, which prescribe no new Matter and Form in Priestly Ordination. And for our Statutes, the Parliament hath answered that Objection sufficiently, shewing clearly, that the Ordination of our first Protestant Bishops was legall, and for the Validity of it, we crave no mans favour.

Their last witnesse is *Dr. Harding*, who had as good a will (if there had been any reality in it) to have spoken of the *Nagges head* Ordination as the best, but he speaketh not a Syllable of it more then the rest: and though they keep a great stirre with him, he bringeth nothing that is worth the weighing. First he readeth us a profound Lecture, that Sacerdos *Signifieth both a Priest and a Bishop*. Let it signify so, and

and in *St. Hieroms* sense, what will he inferre from thence? Next, he askes Bishop Iewell *of Bishoply and Priestly vocation and sending*. What new canting language is this? Could he not as well have made use of the old Ecclesiasticall word of *Ordination*? Thirdly he taxeth the Bishop, that *he answereth not by what example hands were laid on him, or who sent him*. What doth this concern any question between them and us? Hands were laid on him by the example of Christ, of his Apostles, of the Primitive and Modern Church: so Christ set him, the King set him, the Church sent him, in severall respects. He telleth us, that when he had *duely considered* his Protestant Ordination in King *Edwards* time, *he did not take himself for lawfull deacon in all respects*. If his Protestant Ordination were a Nullity (as these mē say), thē he was a lawfull Deacon in no respect. Pope *Paul* the 4. and Cardinall *Poole* were of another mind. Then follow his two grand exceptions against our Ordination, wherein you shal find nothing of your *Nagges head* fable. The former exceptiō is, that King *Edwards* Bishops *who gave Orders, were out of Orders themselves*. The second is, that *they ministred not orders according to the Rite ād manner of the Catholick Church*. For the former exception, I referre him to the Councell of *Carthage* in

St,

St. *Austins* time, and for both his exceptions to Cardinall *Poles* Confirmation of King *Edwards* Bishops and Priests, and *Paul* the 4. Ratification of his Act. If any man have a mind to inquire further into the Validity of our Form of Ordination, let him leave these Fables and take his scope freely. To all this they say, that *Bishop* Iewell *answers with profound silence*, yet they adde, *only he sayes without any proofe, that their Bishops are made by Forme and Order, and by the Consecration of the Arch bishop and other three Bishops, and by admission of the Prince.* I expected profound silence, but I find a profound answer; this is the first time I learned how a man can both keep profound silence and answer so pertinently all at once. How doth Dr. *Harding* goe about to take away this answer: For Bishop *Iewell* was the dependent, and the burthen of the proofe did not rest upon him? First I pray you *how was our Archbishop consecrated?* If *Dr. Harding* did not see his Consecration, he might have seen it if he would. He askes further, *what three Bishops were there in the Realm to lay hands upon him?* Ask the Queens Letters patents, and they will shew you seven. What a take Socraticall kind of arguing is this, together by questions, without any Inference? If *Dr. Harding* could have said it justly

justly, (and he could have said it if it had been so), he should have confuted him boldly, and told him your Metropolitan was consecrated in the *Nagges head*, by one single Bishop, in a fanaticall and phantasticall manner: but he did not, he durst not do it, because he knew it to be otherwise, and it was publickly known to be otherwise. All his exception is against our Form. *If you had been Consecrated after the Form and Order which hath ever been used, you might have had Bishops out of* France *or at home in* England. It is the Forme established in King *Edwards* time, and restored in Queen *Elisabeths* time, which Doctr. *Harding* impugneth, not that ridiculous Form which they Father upon Bishop *Scory*: and their cheife objection against that Form, was that vain Cavill that it was not restored by Act of Parliament, which since hath been answered abundantly by an Act of Parliament. Here upon he telleth Bishop *Iewell*, that *his Metropolitan had no lawfull Consecration*. Though his Consecration had not been lawfull, yet it might have been valid, but it was both legall and valid. This is all that Doctr. *Harding* hath, which a much meaner Scholler

Schollar then that learned Prelate might have adventured upon, without feare of burning his Fingers.

Their next proofe againſt our Records, is taken from the Contradictions of our Writers, Mr. Maſons *Regiſters and Records, diſagree with thoſe that* Mr. Goodwin *uſed in his Catalogue of Bishops, ſometimes in the Day ſometimes in the moneth, ſometimes in the yeare.* And againe, *Mr. Maſon Sutcliffe and Mr. Butler, all ſpeaking of* Mr. Parkers *Conſecration, doe all differ one from another in naming his Conſecraters;* Mr. Maſon *ſaith it was done by Barlow, Story, Coverdale, and Hodgſkins.* Mr. Sutcliffe *ſaith, beſides the three firſt there vvas tvvo Suffragans.* M Butler *ſaith, the Suffragan of* Dover *vvas one, vvho is not named in the Commiſſion. So as theſe men ſeem to have had three Diſagreeing Regiſters.* I anſwer, firſt that it is ſcarcely poſſible to avoid errours in tranſcribing and printing of Bookes, in the Authors abſence, eſpecially in names and numbers. To keep a balling and a ſtirre about theſe *Errata* of the pen or of the preſſe, is like the barking of little Curres, which

which trouble the whole Vicinage about the Mooneshining in the Water. Such were the most of these.

Secondly supposing that some very few of these were the reall mistakes of the Authors, yet innocent mistakes, which have no plot in them or design of Interest or Advantage, which conduce neither *pro* nor *contra* to any Controversy that is on Foot, they ought not to be exaggerated or pressed severely; It is the Wisdome of a wise man to passe by an Infirmity. Such are all these petty Differences. Whether Arch-Bishop *Parker* was consecrated by three City Bishops and two Suffragan, or by three City Bishops and one Suffragan Bishop, and whether this one Suffragan were Suffragã of *Bedford* or Suffragan of *Dover*, cõduceth nothing to any Controversy which is on Foot in the Church, and signifieth nothing to the Validity or invalidity, legality or illegality, canonicalnesse or uncanonicalnesse of his Ordination. All Memories are not so happy, to remember names and numbers, after a long distance of time, especially if they entered but by the eare and were not *Oculis subjecta fidelibus*. If any man should put me to depose (wanting my notes and memorialls,) what Priests

did

did impose hands upon me with Archbishop *Mathews* at my Priestly Ordination, or what Bishops did joine with my Lord Primate of *Ireland* at my Episcopall Ordination; I could not doe it exactly. I know there were more then the Canons doe require, at either Ordination; and referre my self to the Register. Whether two Suffragaus or one Suffragan, is an easy mistake, when there were two in the Commission, and but one at the Consecration: so is the Suffragan of *Dover* for the Suffragan of *Bedford*.

Thirdly, whether these were the faults of the pen or the presse or the Authour: yet after retractation it ought not to be objected. It is inhumane to charge any man with that fault, which he himself had corrected and amended. Bishop *Goodwin* corrected all these errours himself, without any Monitor, and published his Correction of his errours to the world in Print long since, in a new Edition of his booke. Likewise Dr. *Sutcliffe* acknowledged his mistake and gave order to *Mr. Mason* to publish it to the world, as he did.

To ground exceptions upon the errours of the presse, or the slips of the tongue or

pen or of the memory, after they have been publickly amended, is like flies to delight in sores, and neglect the body when it is sound. I have the same errour crept into a booke of mine, of [five] for [four], how it came I know not, for the booke was printed in my absence: but I have corrected it in mine own Copy and in many Copies of my Friends, where I meet with the booke.

Lastly, there is no danger in such petty differences, so long as all parties doe submit themselves to the publick Registers of the Church, as all these writers doe; although is may be some of them were better acquainted with Polemick Writers, then with Registers, or the practicall customes of the Church of *England*. The very Reference or submission of themselves to the Register, is an Implicit retractation of their errours. As in a City the Clocks may differ, and the peoples Iudgements of the time of the day, but both Clocks and Clerkes must submit to the Sun dyall when the sun shineth out: so all private memorialls must be, and are submitted to the publick Register of the Church. Where these Fathers talk of plurality of Registers, they erre because they understand not our Customes. Every Bi-

shop

shop throughout the Kingdome hath one Regiſtry at leaſt, every Dean and Chapter hath a Regiſtry. The ordinations of Prieſts and Deacons, and the Inſtitution of Clerkes to Benefices, are recorded in the Regiſtries of the reſpective Bishops, in whoſe dioceſſes they are ordeined and inſtituted. The elections of Bishops and Inthroniſations and Inſtallations, in the Regiſtry of the reſpective Deans and Chapiters: and the Confirmations and Conſecrations of Bishops, in the Regiſtry of the Archbishop where they are conſecrated; except the Archbishop be pleaſed to grant a Commiſſion to ſome other Bishops, to Conſecrate the elected and confirmed Bishop in ſome other place. But the ſame thing can not be recorded originally but in one Regiſtry.

CAP. VIII.

Dr. Whitaker and Dr. Fulke defended, Bishop Barlowes Consecration justified, of Iohn Stowes Testimony, and the Earle of Notinghams &c.

HEre the Fathers take upon them the office of Iudges or Censors rather then of Advocates. *Mr. Mason ought to have answered as Mr. Whitaker and Mr. Fulke,* (they were both eminent *Drs.* in the Schooles) *who had reason to be better informed of the Records then he.* How? Nay not half so well. They were both contemplative men, Cloistered up in *St. Iohns* College, better acquainted with Polemick writers, then with Records, They were both ordeined Deacons and Priests legally, Canonically, according to the Form prescribed by the Church of England: and were no such ill Birds to defile their own nests. If the Records of their Ordination will satisfy you, that they were no Enthusiasts, (as you imagin,) you may quickly receive satisfaction: But if they had said any thing contrary to our Lawes and Canons, you must not

not thinke to wrangle the Church of England out of a good poſſeſſion, by private voluntary ſpeculations. Let us ſee what theſe Doctrs ſay as you allege them, for I have not their bookes in preſent. Mr. *Whitaker* ſaith, *I would not have you thinke we make ſuch reckoning of your Orders, as to hold our own Vocation unlawfull without them.* You ſee Doctor *Whitaker* juſtifieth our Ordination in this very place as lawfull, and much more plainly elſwhere in his writings. That *though our Bishops and Miniſters be not Ordeined by Papiſticall Bishops, yet they are orderly and lawfully ordeined*: Again, *The Romaniſts account none lawfull Paſtors, but ſuch as are created according to their Form or Order.* Theſe are your two main Objections againſt our Ordination, that we are not ordeined by Bishops of your Communion. That we are not ordeined according to the Roman Form. In both of theſe Doctor *Whitaker* is wholy for us againſt you, that which he maketh no reckoning of, is your Form of Ordination, as it is contradiſtinct from ours, as it is in many things, eſpecially in your double matter and Form in Prieſtly Ordination.

You ſay Mr. *Fulke* ſpeakes more plainly Let us heare him. *You are highly deceived*

if you thinke we esteem your Offices of Bishops Priests and Deacons better then Laymen: and with all our heart we defie, abhorre, detest, and spit at your stinking, greasy, Antichristian Orders. This is high enough indeed, and might have been expressed in more moderate termes: but it is to be expounded, not of the invalidity of your Ordination, as if it wanted any Essentiall, but partly in respect of the not using or abusing these sacred Offices, and partly in respect of the Lawes of *England*. Excesses may make an Ordination unlawfull, although they do not make it invalid. Holy Orders are an excellent Grace conferred by God for the Conversion of men: but if those who have them, instead of preaching truth do teach errours to his people, and adulterate the old Christian Faith by addition of new Articles, they are no longer true Pastors, but Wolves which destroy the Flock, and so they are not onely no better, but worse then Lay men, *Corruptio optimi pessima.* In this respect they tell you, that your Priests and Bishops are no true Priests and Bishops, as *Marcellus* told his Soldiers that they were no true Romans (who were naturall Romans) because they wanted the old Roman virtue. Lastly you have

habituall power to exercise these Offices, but you want actuall power in *England*, by reason of the not application, or rather the substraction of the matter by our Lawes: so you are no legall Bishops or Priests there. This I take to have been the sense of these two Doctors.

Now are we come to their grand exception, against Bishop *Barlow*, who was one of the Consecraters of Archbishop *Parker*, whose Consecration is not found in the Archbishops Register, and therefore they conclude that he was never consecrated. If this objection were true, yet it doth not render Archbishop *Parkers* Consecration either invalid or uncanonicall, because there were three other Bishops who joined in that Consecration besides Bishop *Barlow*, which is the full number required by the Canons. But this objection is most false. Bishop *Barlow* was a Consecrated Bishop above 20 yeares before the Consecratiō of Archbishop *Parker*. They should have done well to have proposed this doubt in Bishop Barlows lifetime, and then they might have had the Testimony of his Consecraters under an Archiepiscopall or Episco-

Episcopall Seale, for their satisfaction, The Testimony of the Archi-Episcopall Register, is a full proofe of Consecration affirmatively, but it is not a full proofe negatively; such a Bishops Consecration is not recorded in this Register, therefore he was not Consecrated. For first, the negligence of an Officer or some crosse accident might hinder the recording. Secondly Fire or Thieves or some such Casualty might destroy or purloin the Record. Thirdly though it be not recorded in this Register, it may be recorded in another, the Arch Bishop may, and Arch Bishop *Cranmer* usually did delegate or give Commission to three other Bishops for Consecration. And though the work be ordinarily performed at *Lambeth*, because of the place, where they may have three Bishops alwaies present without any further Charge: yet they are not obliged by any Law to Consecrate them there. And if there be a sufficient number of Bishops near the Cathedrall which is to be filled, or if the person who is to be Consecrated do desire it, they may be Consecrated either in that, or any of their own Churches. The Bishops of the Province of Yorke, by reason of the former convenience

nience are usually consecrated at *Lambeth*, yet I have known in my time Bishop *Sinewes* of *Carlile* consecrated at Yorke upon his own desire, by the Archbisop of *Yorke*, and the Bishops of *Durham*, *Chester*, and *Mā* A man might seek long enough for his Consecration in the Archbishop of *Canterburies Register* and misse it, but it is to be found in the Register at Yorke. So the Omission of it in that Register though it be no full proofe, yet it is a probable proofe that Bishop *Barlow* was not Consecrated there, but it is no proofe at all that he was not Consecrated elswere.

And this I take to have been the case both of Bishop *Barlow* and Bishop Gardiner: and although the effluxion of above an hundred yeares since, hath rendered it more difficult to find where it was done, yet by the help of those Records which are in the Court of Faculties, I should not despaire of finding it yet.

But there are so many evident proofes that he was Consecrated, that no ingenuous person can have the Face to deny it. The first reason is, his actuall possession of 4. Bishopricks one after another, St. *Asaph*, St. *Davids*, *Bath and Wells* and *Chichester*, in the Reigns of three Princes. They feign some pretenses why Archbishop *Parker* was

not consecrated Canonically, because there wanted a competent number of Bishops, though it were most false: but what can they feign why Bishop *Barlow* was not consecrated in *Henry* the eighths time? was *Henry* the eighth a Baby to be jeasted withall? In Archbishop *Parkers* case, they suppose all the Bishops to have been stark mad, to cast themselves down headlong from a Precipice, when they had a faire paire of Stairs to descend by: but in Bishop *Barlowes* case they suppose all the world to have been asleep; except there had been such an Vniversall sleep it had been impossible for any man in those dayes to creep into a Bishoprick in *England* without Consecration. To say he is actually possessed of a Bishoprick therefore he is Consecrated, is as clear a Demonstration in the English Law, as it is in nature to say the Sun shineth, therefore it is Day.

But it may be objected, that he held all these Bishopricks as a Commendatory, not in Title, as an Vsufructuary not as a true owner. It is impossible, Vsufructuaries are not elected and confirmed, but Bishop *Barlow* was both elected and Confirmed. The *Conge d'eslire* to the Dean and Chapter, the Letters Patents for his Confirmation, the Commission for the restitution of his Temporalties, do all prove that he was no Vsu-

Vſufructuary but a right owner, This is a ſecond reaſon.

Thirdly, The ſame Letters Patents that doe authoriſe Bishop *Barlowes* Confirmation, did likewiſe Command the Archbishop with the aſſiſtence of other Bishops to Conſecrate him himſelf, or to give a Commiſſiō to other Bishops to Conſecrate him, which if they did not perform within a preſcribed time, or perform after another manner thē is preſcribed by the Law, it was not onely a loſſe of their Bishopricks by the Law of *England*, but a Premunire or the loſſe of all their Eſtates, their Liberties, and a caſting themſelves out of the Kings Protectiō 25, Hen: 8. c. 20. No mē in their right wits would rnn ſuch a hazard, or rather evidētly ruine thēſelves and all their hopes without any need, without any ēd in the whole world. Fourthly, by the ſame Law no man could be acknowledged a Bishop in *England*, but he who was Conſecrated legally, by three Bishops with the conſent of the Metropolitan, but Biſhop *Barlow* was acknowledged to be a true Bishop; The King received his Homage for his Bishoprick; the King commāded him to be reſtored to his Temporalties, which is never done untill the Conſecratiō be paſſed. King *Henry* ſent him into *Scotland* as his Ambaſſadour with the title of Bishop

of

of St. *Davids*; and in his restitution to the Temporalties of that See, the King related that *the Arch Bishop had made him Bishop and Pastor of the Church of St.* Davids. This could not be if he had not been Consecrated.

Thirdly, he was admitted to sit in Parliament as a Consecrated Bishop: for no man can sit there as a Bishop before he be Consecrated, but it is plain by the Records of the house of the Lords that he did sit in Parliament many times in the 31 of *Henry* the 8. in his Episcopall habit, as a Consecrated Bishop; and being neither a Bishop of one of the five Principall Sees, nor a Privy Counseller, he must sit and did sit according to the time of his Consecration, between the Bishops of *Chicheſter* and St. *Asſaph*. What a strange boldnesse, is it to question his Consecration now, whom the whole Parliament, and his Consecraters among the rest, did admit without scruple then as a Cōsecrated Bishop.

Sixthly, There is no act more proper or essentiall to a Bishop then Ordination. *What doth a Bishop that a Priest doth not* (saith St. Hierom) *except Ordination*? But it is evident by the Records of his own See, that Bishop *Barlow* did Ordein Priests and

acons

Deacons frō time to time, and by the Arch Bishops Regiſter that he, joined in Epiſcopall Ordination, and was one of thoſe three Bishops who impoſed hands upon Bishop Buckley Feb. 19. 1541.

Seventhly, there is nothing that trieth a Bishops Title to his Church more then the Validity and Invalidity of his Leaſes. If Bishop Barlow had been unconſecrated, all the Leaſes which he made in the See of St. *Davids, and Bath and Wells*, had been voide, and it had been the eaſieſt thing in the whole world for his Succeſſour in thoſe dayes, to prove whether he was conſecrated or not, but they never queſtioned his Leaſes, becauſe they could not queſtion his Conſecration.

Laſtly, an unconſecrated perſon hath neither Anteceſſors nor Succeſſors, he ſucceedeth no man, no man ſucceedeth him. If a grant of any hereditaments be made to him and his Succeſſours, it is abſolutely voide, not worth a deaf Nut; If he alien any Lands belonging to his See from him and his Succeſſours, it is abſolutely void: But Bishop *Barlow* received the Priory of *Brackwork* from the Crown, to him and his Succeſſors Bishops of St. *Davids*; and in King *Edwards* reign being Bishop of Bath and

and *Wells*, he alienated from him and his Succeſſours to the Crown much Land, and received back again from the Crown to him and his Succeſſours equivalent Lands. If he had been unconſecrated all theſe Acts had been utterly void. In ſumme, whoſoever dreameth now, that all the world were in a dead ſleep then, for twenty yeares together, whileſt all theſe things were acting, is much more aſleep himſelf.

To theſe undeniable proofes I might adde as many more out of the Records of the Chancery, if there needed any to prove him a Conſecrated Bishop. As,

A grant to the ſaid *William Barlow* Biſhop of St. *Davids*, to hold in Commendam with the ſaid Biſhoprick the Rectory of *Carewe* in the county of *Pembrooke*, Dated Octob. the 29. Anno 38. Hen. 8.

A commiſſion for Tranſlation of *William Barlow* Biſhop of St. *Davids* to the Biſhoprick of *Bath* and *VVels*, Dated. 3. Feb. 2. Edv. 6.

A Commiſſion for the Conſecration of *Robert Farrer* to be Biſhop of *St. Davids*, *per tranſlationem VVillelmi Barlow &c.* Dated 3. Iul. Anno 2. Edv. 6.

A

A Commission for the Restitution of the Temporalties of the said Bishoprick to the said *Robert Farrer*, as being void *per translationem Willelmi Barlow*. Dated 1. Augusti Anno 2. Edv. 6. In all which Records and many more he is alwaies named as a true Consecrated Bishop.

And lastly, in Bishop *Goodwins* booke *de Præsulibus Angliæ* pa. 663. of the Latin Edition printed at *London* Anno 1616. in his Catalogue of the Bishops of *St. Assaph* num. 37. he hath these words. *Gulielmus Barlow Canonicorum Regularium apud Bisham Prior Consecratus est. Feb.* 22. *Anno* 1535; *Aprili deinde sequente Meneviam translatus est. VVilliam Barlow Prior of the Canons Regulars at Bisham was consecrated the two and twentieth Day of February, in the yeare* 1535, *and in Aprill Followving vvas translated to St. Davids.* Which confirmeth me in my former conjecture, that he was Consecrated in *Wales*, which Bishop Goodwin by reason of his Vicinity, had much more reason to know exactly then we have.

They

They say Mr. Mason *acknowledgeth that* Mr Barlow *was the man who consecrated Parker, because* Hodgskins *the Suffragan of Bedford was onely an Assistent in that action: and the Assistents in the Protestant Church doe not consecrate.* By the Fathers leave, this is altogether untrue. Neither was Bishop *Barlow* the onely man who Consecrated Archbishop *Parker*; Neither was Bishop Hodgskins a meere Assistent in that action; Thirdly, who soever doe impose hands are joint consecraters, with us as wel as them; Lastly, *Mr. Mason* saith no such thing as they affirm, but directly the Contrary, that all the foure Bishops were equally Consecraters, all imposed hands, all joined in the words, and this he proveth out of the Register it self, L. 3. c. 9. n. 8. & l: 3. c. 10. n. 9.

They object *He might as well be proved to have been a lawfull Husband, because he had a woman, and diverse Children, as to have been a Consecrated Bishop because he ordeined. and Discharged all acts belonging to the Order of a Bishop.* What was Bishop *Barlowes*

Woman

Woman pertinent to his cauſe. Are not Governants, and Devoteſſes, beſides ordinary maidſervants, women?

All which Paſtours not onely of their own Communion, but of their own Society, are permitted to have in their houſes. Let themſelves be Iudges whether a Woman a wife, or a Woman a Governant or a Devoteſſe, be more properly to be ranged under the name or notion of *συνεισακτῶν*, ſuch women as were prohibited to Cohabit with Clerkes by the Councell of *Nice*. But to leave the *Hypotheſis* and come to the *Theſis*, as being more pertinent to the preſent caſe. If a man have cohabited long with a Woman as man and wife in the Generall eſtimation of the world, and begot children upon her, and dies as her huſband without any doubt or diſpute during his life and long after, though all the Witneſſes of their Marriage were dead, and the Regiſter loſt, this their Conjugall cohabitation and the common reputation of the world during his Life uncontroverted, is in Law a ſufficient proofe of the Marriage: but all the world *nemine contradicente* eſteemed Biſhop *Barlow* as the undoubted Biſhop and Spouſe of his Church.

They adde, *Ridley Hooper Farrer were acknowledged and obeyed as Bishops in King* Edwards *time, yet were Iudged by both the Spirituall and Temporall Court not to have been consecrated.* They mistake, they were not judged not to have been consecrated, (for their Consecrations are upon Record,) but not to have been consecrated *ritu Romano*, after the Roman Form. And who gave this Iudgement? Their open enemies, who made no scruple to take away their Lifes, whose unjust judgement we doe not value a rush: but *Paul* the 4. and Cardinall *Pole*; more authentick Iudges of their own party, gave a later Iudgemēt to the Cōtrary.

They aske, *how it is possible that Barlowes Cōsecration should not be found recorded (if ever it was), as well as his preferment to the Priory of* Bisham, *and Election and Confirmation to the Bishoprick of* St. Assaph. I answer it is very easy to conceive. I have shewed him sundry wayes how it might be, and one probable way how it was. I desire the Reader to observe the extreme partiality of these Fathers, they make it impossible for the Acts of one Consecration to be lost or stollen, and yet accuse us of forging fifteen Consecrations. It is easier to steale fifteen, then to Forge one Act.

We have often asked a reason of them, why

why the Proteſtants should decline their own Conſecrations? They give us one, *The truth is, that* Barlow *as moſt of the Clergy in* England *in thoſe times were Puritans, and inclined to Zuinglianiſme, therefore they contemned and rejected Conſecration as a rag of Rome, and were contented with the extraordinary calling of God and the Spirit, as all other Churches are, who pretend Reformation.* It is well they premiſed *the truth is*, otherwiſe there had not been one word of truth in what they ſay. Firſt how do they know this? It muſt be either by Relation, but I am confident they can name no author for it: or by Revelation, but that they may not doe: or it is (to ſpeake ſparingly) their own Imagination. It is a great boldneſſe, to take the liberty to caſt aſperſions upon the Clergy of a whole Nation. Secondly, how commeth Biſhop *Barlow*, to be taxed of Puritaniſm? we meet him a Prior and a Biſhop, we find him in his Robes, in his Rochet, in his Cope, Officiating, Ordaining, Confirming. He who made no ſcruple to Ordein and Conſecrate others *gratis*, certainly did not forbeare his own Conſecration with the apparent hazard of the loſſe of his Biſhoprick, out of ſcru-

They adde, *Ridley Hooper Farrer were acknowledged and obeyed as Bishops in King* Edwards *time, yet were Iudged by both the Spirituall and Temporall Court not to have been consecrated.* They mistake, they were not judged not to have been consecrated, (for their Consecrations are upon Record,) but not to have been consecrated *ritu Romano*, after the Roman Form. And who gave this Iudgement? Their open enemies, who made no scruple to take away their Lifes, whose unjust judgement we doe not value a rush: but *Paul* the 4. and Cardinall *Pole*; more authentick Iudges of their own party, gave a later Iudgemēt to the Cōtrary.

They aske, *how it is possible that Barlowes Cōsecration should not be found recorded (if ever it was), as well as his preferment to the Priory of* Bisham, *and Election and Confirmation to the Bishoprick of* St. Assaph. I answer it is very easy to conceive. I have shewed him sundry wayes how it might be, and one probable way how it was. I desire the Reader to observe the extreme partiality of these Fathers, they make it impossible for the Acts of one Consecration to be lost or stollen, and yet accuse us of forging fifteen Consecrations. It is easier to steale fifteen, then to Forge one Act.

We have often asked a reason of them, why

why the Protestants should decline their own Consecrations? They give us one, *The truth is, that* Barlow *as most of the Clergy in* England *in those times were Puritans, and inclined to Zuinglianisme, therefore they contemned and rejected Consecration as a rag of Rome, and were contented with the extraordinary calling of God and the Spirit, as all other Churches are, who pretend Reformation.* It is well they premised *the truth is*, otherwise there had not been one word of truth in what they say. First how do they know this? It must be either by Relation, but I am confident they can name no author for it: or by Revelation, but that they may not doe: or it is (to speake sparingly) their own Imagination. It is a great boldnesse, to take the liberty to cast aspersions upon the Clergy of a whole Nation. Secondly, how commeth Bishop *Barlow*, to be taxed of Puritanism? we meet him a Prior and a Bishop, we find him in his Robes, in his Rochet, in his Cope, Officiating, Ordaining, Confirming. He who made no scruple to Ordein and Consecrate others *gratis*, certainly did not forbeare his own Consecration with the apparent hazard of the losse of his Bishoprick, out of scru-

ple of Conſcience. Thirdly, this aſperſion is not well accommodated to the times, For firſt Zuinglianiſme was but short heeled in thoſe Dayes when Bishop *Barlow* was Conſecrated, who ſate in Parliament as a Conſecrated Bishop 31. Henr. 8: and the firſt Sermon that ever Zuinglius Preached as a Probationer, was in *Zurick* in the yeare 1510. that was in the 10. or 11. yeare of Hēry the eighth. If there were any one Zuinglian iu thoſe dayes, upon their grounds, it is moſt likely to have been Bishop *Gardiner*, for his Conſecration doth not appeare more then Bishop *Barlowes*.

But there is yet a greater miſtake in it; it is the Anabaptiſts who *reject Ordination, and content themſelves with the extraordinary calling of the Spirit*, not the *Zuinglians*. In the writings of *Zuinglius* we fiud a Letter of him and ten other of the principall *Helvetian* Theologians, to the Bishop of *Conſtance*; beſeeching him in all humility and obſervance, *to favour and help forward their beginnings, as an excellent work and worthy of a Bishop*; They implore his *Clemency, Wiſdome, learning, that he would be the firſt fruits of the German Bishops*; They beſeech him *by the Common Chriſt, by that fatherly affection which he owes unto them, to looke gra-*

ou

ously upon them &c; They court him *to shew himself a Father, and grant the request of his obedient sonnes. Zuinglius* and the *Zuinglians* liked Bishops well enough, if he could have had them. But the Bishop of *Constance* of another Communion was their Bishop.

HereMeanderlike they make a winding from St. *Asaph* back again to Cheapside, from Bishop *Barlowes* Consecration to Archbishop Parkers. They say, that *if there had been any other Consecration of Archbishop Parker then that of the Nagges head, Iohn Stow would not conceale it in his Annales*; who is so diligent in *setting down all that passed in and about London, and professeth personall respect to him, he having related the Consecration of Cardinall* Pole *with so many particulars.* They adde out of Dr. *Champney*, that Iohn Stow *acknowledged to many persons that the story of the Nagges head was true.* Their store is very low, when they are forced to produce *Iohn Stow*, who scarce knew what a Consecration was. But what saith he in his Chronicles? Not a word, either of the feigned Consecration at the *Nagges head*, or of the true Consecration at *Lambeth*. But *he told it to many persons by word of mouth, that the Story of the Nagges head was very true.* If he did, he lied notoriously

to many persons, but we acquit him of that calumny: let it rest upon them, who think it a meritorious Act, to advance religion by any means true or false, we are too well acquainted with their hearsay reports. They who dare wrest his printed workes, ought not to be trusted what he spake by word of mouth, to some body, whom no body knowes. Their Authour saith *to some persons*, they say *to many persons*, thus this snowball increaseth. *John Stowe* is now dead, and dead men do not bite: yet let us know to whom he said it? Doctor *Champney* tells us, *they are timorous and would not be named.* Good reason, for they have no names: so *John Stow* is a silent witnesse, and they are nameless witnesses.

So much for the man: now for the thing I give three answers. First if *John Stow* were a lover of the truth, he should rather have set down the *Nagges head* Ordination (if there was any such thing) then the *Lambeth* Ordination. Men would suppose the Lambeth Ordination of themselves, where nothing is said to the contrary, it is presumed for the Law: but the *Nagges head* Consecration, had been such a Consecration, as never was before, never will follow after.

Secondly, their Authours wrest *John Stow*

Stow abhominably. He was no profeſt writer of Eccleſiaſticall Annales. It is true he mentioneth the Conſecration of Cardinall *Pole*, whether it was his reſpect to his Eminence, as being a neare Kinsman to the Queen, a Cardinall, the Popes Legate, and his grand Miniſter for the reconciliation of *England*, or becauſe a toy tooke him in the head: but not with ſo many particulars as the Fathers intimate; all he ſaith is this, *the* 21 *of March* Dr. Cranmer *Archbiſhop of* Canterbury *was burnt at* Oxford, *the ſame day Cardinall* Pole *ſang his firſt Maſſe at* Greenwich *in the Friars Church, on Sunday next he was Conſecrated Archbiſhop of* Canterbury (here was ſpeedy worke), *and the* 25 *of March received the Pall with the uſuall Ceremonies at Bowes Church in Cheape.* Here is another *Nagges head* meeting; where he was Conſecrated, by whom, after what Form, he leaveth the Reader to preſume: but of all the other Conſecrations performed in Queen *Maries* time, this diligent Authour mentioneth not ſo much as one; of all the Conſecrations in Queen Elizabeths time, I think not one; of all the Conſecrations in *England* ſince the Conqueſt, not one, or ſo rarely that they are not to be taken notice of. If the Argument of theſe Fathers were of any value

John Stow mentioneth not his Consecration at *Lambeth*, therefore he was not Consecrated there, we never had a Consecration in *England*, since the Conquest, but Cardinal *Poles*: for he mentioneth none but that which I remember, I am sure if he mention any it is most rarely. If the Fathers argument were good, Archbishop *Parker* was never elected, nor confirmed, because his Election and Confirmation are not recordsd by *John Stow*: but all our Records Civil as well as Ecclesiasticall do testify the Contrary.

Lastly, if the Fathers would lay aside their prejudice, there is enough in *John Stowes* Annales, to discover the falshood of their lying Fable of the Consecration at the *Nagges head*. By their account the *Nagges head* Consecration was September 7. Anno 1559, but after this in relating the solemne Obsequies kept in St. *Pauls* Church, for the French King, *John Stow* calleth him, Dr. *Parker Arch-Bishop of Canterbury Elect*, therefore the *Nagges head* Consecration is a lying Fable; if he was still Elect, he was not then Consecrated. But afterward speaking of his Death May 17. 1575, which is the next time I find him mentioned, he stileth him the *right Reverend Father*

ther in God Matthew Parker *Dr. of Divinity Archbishop of Caterbury*. Here is no more the word *Elect*, for after Confirmation and Consecration, the word Elect ceaseth, here he is complete *Archbishop of Canterbury*.

They say, *they who make no Conscience to falsify Scripture will forge Records*: And *how notoriously the English Clergy have falsified Scripture, is Demonstrated by Gregory Martin*. I hope none of us did ever attempt to purge *St. Pauls* Epistles, because there were in them, *Quadam male sonantia*, *Somethings that sounded not well*, in the point of Iustification. We desire good words, untill they be able to prove their allegation. Rather then be accounted falsifiers of Scripture, we are contented to stand to the vulgar Latin, in any Controversy between them and us. But who is the man doth accuse us of so many Falsifications? One *Gregory Martin*, one of their fellowes, whose censure we do not weigh a button. This is a new Inartificiall Kind of arguing, from the Authority of their own Writers.

But they use it much, so it followeth in the next words, *it is want of Charity to think that* Stapleton, Harding, Bristow *and the rest of the English Catholick Doctors, who did*

forsake all at home for Conscience sake, would publish to the world in print, the Nullity of Parkers *Ordination; thereby engaging posterity to commit so many damnable Sacrileges, in reordeining those who had been validly ordeined already, without due examination of the matter.* This plea is much like that of the old Roman, that his Adversary, did not receive the wound with his whole body, that he might have killed him fairly. They would have us rather put up the losse of our Holy Orders, then the skill of their Doctors should be questioned. If Reordinatiõ be *damnable Sacrilege*, the Authority of your own Doctors may be a fit *medium* to convince yourselves of Sacrilege, not us of the Invalidity of our Ordination. I hope *Stephen* the sixthand *Sergius* the third, two Popes, were other manner of men then your English Doctors, and did both pretend to examine the matter as duely, and to be as averse from damnable Sacrilege as you, yet they decreed publickly, and most unjustly, (as you yourselves doe now confesse) that all the holy Orders received from *Formosus* were void, and compelled all those who had been ordeined by him, to be reordeined. *Bell. de Rom. Pont. l.4. cap.* 12.

Mr. Mason cited the Testimony of a wit-

witnesse beyond all exception, *Charles Howard* Earle of *Nottingham*, Lord High Admirall of *England*, who acknowledged Archbishop *Parker* to be his Kinsman, and that he was an invited Guest at his Cõsecration at *Lambeth*. To this the Fathers reply, *If this were trne, it proves onely that there was a good Dinner at* Lambeth, *which might well be to conceale the shamefull Consecration at the* Nagges head. It proves there was a good Consecration, as well as a good Dinner, the words are *to honour his Consecration, and the solemnity thereof with his presence.* It had been something uncivill, to encumber the Tavern with a Consecration, and not stay dinner there. The Earle was invited to the Consecration, at *Lambeth*, therefore it was at *Lambeth*, The Earle was not at the *Nagges head*; Mr. *Neale* himself, who see more then ever was acted, or so much as thought of, did not see that. Is it the Custome when one is invited to a Consecration, to come after it is done to dinner: or to invite a Nobleman to a Consecration in one place, and then be consecrated in another? This had been so farre from concealing the shamefulnesse of such a brainsick Consecration, that it been a ready meanes to divulge it to all the world.

They

They adde, *Besides we must take the Earles Friends word for the Earles Testimony*, and Mr. Masons *word for his nameless Friend*. That is no one of *Mr. Masons* fault, but Mr. *Holywoods*, *Mr. Constables*, *Mr. Sacrobosco's*, *Dr. Champneys*, *Mr. Fitz-Herberts*, *Mr Fitz-Simons*, who first broached this odious Fable. *Mr. Mason* published this relation to the world in print while the Earle was yet living, on purpose that they might enquire and satisfy themselves; if they did not, they can blame no body but themselves; if they did by themselves or their Friends, (as it is most likely they did) it is evident the answer did not content them, and so we never heard more of them since. It had been the greatest folly in the world to allege the Testimony of such a Noble man in his Life time, contrary to his own knowledge, which might have been disproved from his own Authority, and so have easily laid *Mr. Mason* flat upon his back. You may remember your own case with the Bishop of *Durham*. But it was too true to be contradicted then, and too late to be Contradicted now.

They say, *they bring more then one witnesse of the* Nagges head *Consecration*. Pardon me, You never produced one yet, and which is lesse then producing, you never so much

as

as named a witneſſe, whilſt he himſelf was living. In or about the yeare 1603. you firſt named *Mr. Neale* and innocent *Iohn* Stow, when they were both dead; you might as well have named the man in the Moone as *Iohn Stow*. Onely I confeſſe you named the Biſhop of *Durham* in his life time, and you ſee what is the iſſue of it: and if you had named the others in their life times, you muſt have expected a like iſſue, either the perpetuall infamy of your witneſſe, or the utter confuſion of your Cauſe. You ſpeake much of *the learning, and virtue, and judgement* of your hearſay Witneſſes, *who knew how to diſtinguish between an Epiſcopall Conſecration, and a banquet*. I hope you doe not meane that the Earle of *Nottingham* did not know, how to diſtinguish between a banquet and a Conſecration, if he did not, the High Admiralship of England was ill committed to him: or that he had not as much regard to his honour and Conſcience, as any of your Prieſts. We meddle not with their Learning and virtue, but we are no more obliged to take their Teſtimonies upon hearſay, then they would take our Teſtimonies. They have giv̄e an account to God, and know before this time whether they

have

have done well or ill.

They proceed, *The Priests and Iesuits, to whom the Recordes were shewed in King Iames his time, protested against them as forged and improbable, as appeareth by the Testimony of men yet living, whose honesty cannot be called in question. Father* Faircloth, *one of the imprisoned Iesuits, testified so much to many by word of mouth and in writing.* Where is the writing? where is the protestation? why are they not produced? Still here are no proofes but upon Hearsay. One eye Witnesse is worth an hundred such, who can sweare to no more but that they heard it, and God knowes through how many Hucksters hands. I hope the Bishop of *Durhams* case will make them more wary for the future.

But they are angry with *some Protestants, who endeavour to make this well grounded story a meer Fable, and thereby call many persons of much more learning, virtue, and prudence then themselves Fooles or knaves.* We are plain *Macedonians*, who call a Fable a Fable, without either welt or gard: yea, so notorious a Fable, that (but that you tellus the Contrary), we could not believe that any one of you did ever give any credit to it your selves; any more then the *Athenians* did believe those monstrous Fables of Bulls

and

and Minotaures, which themſelves had raiſed, becauſe ſome of their eminent Citizens had deviſed it or related it: But we call no men *Fooles or Knaues*, That language is too unmannerly for civill Writers. What new Topick is this, becauſe we cannot beleeve armans relation or his Iudgement, do we ſtraightway call him Foole or Knave? Excuſe me, there are credulity, and prejudice, and miſtakes, and pious frauds in the world, and none of theſe will willingly weare the Livery of Knaves or Fooles. We are not of the ſame mind with Pope *Stephen* and Pope *Sergius*, for the reordeining of thoſe, who had been ordeined by *Formoſus*, yet we do not call them *knaves or Fooles*. We cannot beleeve what you yourſelves have related of my Lord of *Durham*, yet we are not guilty of ſuch extravagant expreſſions.

CAP,

CAP. IX.

The Fathers insist too much upon the Authority of their own party, Why Consecration is not mentioned at Restitution, The exactnesse of our Records justified.

IT seemeth to me, that the Fathers insist too much upon the honesty, and virtue, and learning of their own party: In dispute with an Adversary, virtue is like fire, which preserveth it self by being covered with ashes: but spread abroad by ostentation, it is quickly extinguished; especially Comparisons are odious, and beget altercation. We say, there is not a Hill so high in *Lincolnshire*, but there is another within a Mile as high as it: take you the reputation of learning and prudence, so you leave us the better cause; and we shall be able to defēd it well enough against you. But the maine defect in this part of your discourse is this, the Bishop of *Chalcedon* confesseth of Mr. *Oldcorn*, one of your Order, that he acknowledged these Records to be Authentick, and the rest of the impri-

impriſoned Prieſts, who viewed the Records, are charged publickly in print to have done the ſame, by Bishop Goodwin, by Mr. Maſon; every thing ought to be unlooſed the ſame way it is bound. They were all Schollars and could write, if this charge were not true, they ought to have published a Proteſtation to the world in print to the contrary, whileſt their Adverſaries were living, whileſt the Witneſſes were living: but now after they and their Adverſaries, and the witneſſes are all ſo long dead, to talke of a verball proteſtation to ſome of their Friends, upon hearſay, ſignifieth nothing.

Now we muſt make another winding, and return to Bishop *Barlow*: but I hold to the clue, in hope at length to get out of this fictitious Labyrinth. *Henry the* 8. *Letters Patents, vvhereby Bishop* Barlow *vvas inſtalled in* (they would ſay reſtored to) *the Temporalties of his Bishoprick, make mention of his acceptation and Confirmation, but none of his Conſecration. why ſhould this laſt be omitted, if he were really conſecrated?* This objectiō sheweth nothing, but the unſkilfulneſſe of the Fathers in our English Cuſtomes and Forms.

Let them compare all the restitutions of their friends to their Temporalties in England, as Cardinall *Poles*, Bishop *Gardiners* and the rest, and they shall find the Form the very same with Bishop *Barlowes*; I hope they will not conclude thence that none of them were consecrated. The reason of the Forme is very prudent, In a Restitution to Temporalties, they take no notice of any Acts that are purely Spirituall, as Consecration is: but onely of such Acts as are Temporall, as Acceptation and Confirmation.

But *if he was restored to his Temporalties not being Consecrated, he might also sit in Parliament without Consecration.* The Assumtion is understood, *but Bishop* Barlow *was restored to his Temporalties without Consecration*; which is most false. From the Conversion of the Nation untill this Day, they are not able to produce one instance, of one Bishop, who was duely Elected, duely confirmed, and duely restored to his Temporalties by the Kings Mandate, without Consecration, or did sit in Parliament without Consecration. He must sit in Parliament in his Episcopall habit, but that cannot be before Consecration. It seemeth they think that Bishops sit in Parliament, as Temporall

porall Barons: but it a great mistake, Bishops sate in the Great Councells of the Kingdome, before the names of Parliament or Barons were heard of in *England*.

They bring an Argument from *the exactnesse of our Records*, and that connexion that is between Records of one Court and another. The first thing necessary to obtein a Bishoprick in *England*, is the Kings *Conge d'eslire*; that appears in the Rolles. Next, the actuall Election; that appeares in the Records of the Dean and Chapiter. Thirdly, the Kings Acceptation of the Election, and his Commission to the Archbishop, or four Bishops in the Vacancy, to Confirm the Election and Consecrate the person Elected and Confirmed legally; that appeares in the Letters Patents enrolled. Fourthly, the Confirmation of the Election before the Dean of the Arches, but by the Archbishops appointment, (this is performed alwaies in *Bow* Church, except extraordinarily it be performed elsewhere by Commission); this appeares in the Records of the Archbishop. Fifthly, the Consecration it self by the Archbishop and other Bishops, or other Bishops without him by vertue of his Commission; this appeares in the Records of the Protonothary of the See

of Canterbury. Lastly the Restitution of the Temporalties; which appeares in the Rolles, and his Enthronisation in the Records of the Dean and Chapiter. Every one of these takes another by the hand, and he who will enjoy a Bishoprick in *England*, must have them all. The Chapiter cannot elect without the Kings *Conge d'Eslire*. The King never grants his Letters Patents for Confirmation and Consecration, untill he have a Certificate of the Deã and Chapiters Electiõ. The Dean of the *Arches* never confirms, untill he have the Kings Commission. The Archbishop never Consecrates untill the Election be confirmed. And lastly the King never receiveth Homage for the Bishoprick, or giveth the Temporalties, nor the Deã and Chapiter Enthrone, untill after Consecration. He that hath any one of these acts, must of Necessity have all that goe before it in this Method: and he that hath the last, hath them all. But this was more then Mr. Neale, or whosoever was Inventer of that silly Fable, did understãd, otherwise he would have framed a more possible relatiõ.

Hence they argue, The Records *being so exact, how is it possible that no Copies of Barlowes Consecration do appeare in any Court or Bishoprick of* England? They mistake the matter wholy, the Consecration ought not to ap-

appeare in any Court but one, that is that Regiſtry where he was Conſecrated, which being not certainly known, at ſo great a diſtance of time, is not ſo eaſily found, and I believe was never ſought for yet further thē *Lambeth*. But all the other Acts doe appeare in their proper Courts; The Kings Licenſe, the Dean and Chapiters Election, the Kings Letters Patents, the Confirmation of the Dean of the Arches, which all goe before Conſecration: and his doing Homage, and the Reſtitution of him to his Temporalties, and his Enthroniſation, all which dō follow the Conſecration, and are infallible proofes in Law of the Conſecration: as likewiſe his ſitting in Parliament, his Ordeining of Prieſts, his Conſecrating of Biſhops, his letting of Leaſes, his receiving of Heriditamēts to him and his Succeſſours, his exchanging of Lands; all which are as irrefragable proofes of his Conſecration, as any man hath to prove that ſuch perſons were his Parents, either Father or Mother. And whē the right Regiſter is ſought, which muſt be by the help of the Court of Faculties, I doubt not but his Conſecration will be found in the proper place, as all the reſt are.

Mr. Maſon alleged, that Biſhop *Gardiners* Conſecration was not to be found in the Regiſter of *Lambeth*, any more then Biſhop

shop *Barlowes*: yet no man doubted of his Ordination. They answer first, that Mr. Mason did not seek so solicitously or diligently *for Bishop* Gardiners *Consecration, as for Bishop* Barlowes. Then why do not they whom it doth concern, cause more diligent search to be made? without finding the Records of Bishop *Gardiners* Consecration, they cannot accuse Bishop *Barlow* of want of Consecration, upon that onely reason. Secondly they answer, that if Gardiners *Consecration, were as doubtfull as* Barlowes *and* Parkers, *they would take the same advise they give us, to repaire with speed to some other Church of undoubted Clergy*. Yes, where will they find a more undoubted Clergy? They may goe further and fare worse. *Rome* itself hath not more exact Records, nor a more undoubted Succession, then the Church of *England*. There is no reason in the world to doubt either of Archbishop *Parkers* Consecration, or Bishop *Gardiners*, or Bishop *Barlowes*. Neither doth his Consecration concern us so much, as the Fathers imagine: there were three Consecraters (which is the Canonicall number) besides him.

It is high time for the Fathers to wind up, and draw to a Conclusion of this Argumēt. That which followeth next is too high and

and can ſcarcely be tolerated; to accuſe the publick Records and Archives of the Kingdome, and to inſimulate the Primates and Metropolitans of *England* of Forgery, upon no ground but their own Imaginatiõ. I doubt whether they durſt offer it to a widow Woman. *As to the impoſſibility of forging ſo many Regiſters, in caſe there be ſo many, it is eaſily anſwered, that it is no more then that the Conſecraters and other perſons concerned, ſhould have conſpired to give in a falſe Certificate, that the Conſecration was performed with all due Cerimonies and Rites, and thereby deceive the Courts or make them diſſemble.* Should any man accuſe the Generall of their order, or one of their Provincialls, or but the Rector of one of their Colleges, of Forgery and counterfeiting the publick Records of the Order; how would they ſtorm, and thunder, and mingle heaven and earth together and cry out, *No moderate or prudent perſons can ſuſpect that ſuch perſons ſhould damne their ſoules, that ſo many pious learned Divines ſhould engage themſelves and their poſterity, in damnable Sacrileges, without feare of damnation.*

If a man will not believe every ridiculous Fable, which they tell by word of mouth upon hearsay, they *call persons of more virtue learning and prudence then themselves, Fooles and Knaves*: But they may insimulate the principall Fathers of our Church, of certifying most pernicious lyes under their hands and seales, not for a piece of bread, which is a poore temptatiō, but for nothing, that is to make them both *Fooles and Knaves*. Is not this blowing hot and cold with the same breath? *or to have the Faith of our Lord Iesus Christ with respect of persons*? Compare the politicall principles of the Church of *England* with your own, and try if you can find any thing so pernicious to mankind and all humane Society, in ours more then in yours. Compare the Case Theology of the Church of *England*, with your own, and try if you can find any thing so destructive to Morality, to truth, and Iustice, and Conscience, as might lead us to perpetrate such Crimes more then yourselves. We are not affraid of a Paralell. You professe great endeavours to make Proselites; we do not condemne Zeale, yet wish you had more light with it: even in prudence, which you yourselves extoll, this is not your right Course, to follow those Birds, with noise and clamour, which you desire to catch.

In

In ſumme, your anſwer or ſolution is full of ignorant miſtakes. It confoundeth Civill Rolles and Eccleſiaſticall Regiſters. It ſuppoſeth that our Records are but tranſcriptions, one out of another; whereas every Court recordeth its own Acts, and keeps itſelf within its own bounds. It taketh notice but of one Conſecrater: where as we have alwaies three at the leaſt, many times five or ſix. It quite forgetteth publick Notaries, which muſt be preſent at every Conſecration with us, to draw up what is done into Acts; with us every one of theſe Notaries when he is admitted to that charge doth take a ſolemne Oath upon his knees to diſcharge his Office faithfully, that is, not to make falſe Certificates. Secondly, it is abſurd and unſeaſonable, to enquire how a thing came to paſſe that never was: you ought Firſt to have proved, that our Records were forged, and then it had been more ſeaſonable to have enquired modeſtly, how it came to paſſe. Thirdly, it is incredible, that perſons of ſuch prudence and eminence, ſhonld make falſe Certificates under their hands and ſeales, to the utter ruine of themſelves and all that had a hand it, and no advantage to any perſon breathing. It is incredible that thoſe

Records

Records should be counterfeited in a corner, which were avowed publickly for Authentick by the whole Parliament of *England* in the 8 yeare of Queen *Elisabeth*; which were published to the world in print by the person most concerned, as if he dared all the world to except against them: and yet no man offered to except against them then. Fourthly, it is impossible to give in a false Certificate of a Consecration which was never performed in *England*, (especially at *Lambeth*) before lesse then thousands of eye witnesses: and that at *Lambeth*, in the Face of the Court and Westminster Hall. Surely they thinke we consecrate in Closets, or holes, or haymowes. They may even as well say that the publick Acts of our Parliaments are counterfeited, and the publick Acts of our Synods are counterfeited, and all our publick monuments counterfeited. It is none of the honestest Pleas, *Negare factum*, to deny such publick Acts as these. Fifthly, this answer is pernicious to mankind, it is destructive to all Societies of men, that Bishops of so great eminence, should conspire with publick Notaries, to give in false Certificates, in a matter of such High Consequence as Holy Orders are, without any temptation,

with

without any hope of Advantage to themselves or others. It affordeth a large Seminary for jealousies and suspicions. It exterminateth all credit and confidence out of the world, and instructeth all men to trust nothing, but what they see with their eyes. Lastly, it is contradictory to themselves; They have told us, I know not how often, and tell us again in this Paragraph, That *if the* Nagges head *Consecration had been false, they might have convinced it by a thousand witnesses*: Here they make it an *easy* thing, for *the Consecraters and other persons concerned, to conspire together to give in a false Certificate, that the Consecration was performed with all due Ceremonies and Rites*, and thereby deceive the *Courts or make them dissemble*. If the world will be deceived so, it is but right and reason that it be deceived; to be deceived by a false Certificate, that may be convinced by a thousand witnesses, is selfdeceit.

But they say, *this is more possible and more probable, then that all the Clergy should conspire not to produce the same Registers, when they were so hardly pressed by their Adversaries*. These are but empty pretenses, there was no pressing to produce Registers, nor any thing objected that did deserve the production of

of a Regiſter. That which was objected againſt our Orders in thoſe dayes was about the Form of Ordination published by Edward the ſixth, and the Legality of our Ordination in the time of Queen *Eliſabeth*; the *Nagges head* Conſecration was never objected in thoſe dayes. Beſides, Regiſters are Publick enough themſelves, and need no production; and yet our Regiſters were produced, produced by the Parliament 8 *Eliſab.* who cited them as authentick Records, produced and published to the world in Print, that was another production.

They adde, *Or that ſo many Catholicks ſhould have been ſo foolish to invent or maintein the Story of the* Nagges head, *in ſuch a time when if it had been falſe, they might have been convinced by a thouſand Witneſſes.* Feare them not, they were wiſer then to publish ſuch a notorious Fable in thoſe dayes; they might perchance whiſper it in Corners among themſelves, but the boldeſt of them durſt not maintain it, or object it in print, for feare of ſhame and disgrace. It was folly to give any eare to it, but is was knavery to invent it: and to doe it after ſuch a bungling manner, (whoſoever was the Inventer) was knavery and Folly complicated together.

If

If the Fathers write any more upon this subject, I desire them to bring us no more *heareſay* testimonies of their owne party; whatsoever esteeme they may have themselves, of their judgment, and prudence, and impartiality. It is not the manner of Polemick writers to urge the authority of their owne Doctors to an Adversary, or allege the moderne practise of their present Church. We have our owne Church and our owne Doctors as well as they. If we would pinne our faith to the sleeues of their Writers, and submit to their judgments, and beleeve all their reportes, and let all things be as they would have it, we needed not to have any more controversy with them: but we might well raise a worse controversy in our selves with our owne consciences.

CAP.

CHA. XI.

Of our formes of Epiſcopall and prieſtly ordination, of Zuinglianiſme, of Arch Biſhop Lavvd, of ceremonies. Our aſſurance of our Orders.

WE have done with the Nagges head for the preſent. That which followeth next doth better become Schollers, as having more shew of truth and reality in it. They object that *in all the Catholick Ritualls, not onely of the weſt but of the Eaſt, there is not one forme of conſecrating Biſhops, that hath not the word Biſhops in it, or ſome other words expreſſing the particular authority and power of a Biſhop diſtinctly. But in our Conſecration, there is not one word to expreſſe the difference and power of Epiſcopacy. For theſe vvordes* [*receive the holy Ghoſt*] *are indifferent to prieſthood and Epiſcopacy, and uſed in both Ordinations.* I anſwer, that the forme of Epiſcopall Ordination uſed at the ſame time when hands are impoſed, is the ſame both in their forme and ours, [*Receive the holy Ghoſt*]. And if theſe words be conſidered

ſingly

singly in a divided ſenſe from the reſt of the Office, there is nothing either in our forme or theirs which doth diſtinctly and reciprocally expreſſe Epiſcopall power and Authority. But if theſe words be conſidered coniointly in a compounded ſenſe, there is enough to expreſſe Epiſcopall power and authority diſtinctly, and as much in our forme as theirs.

Firſt two Bishops preſent the Bishop elect to the Arch-Bishop of the Province, with theſe words, *moſt Reverend Father in Chriſt, we preſent to you this godly and learned man to be Conſecrated Bishop.* There is one expreſſion.

Then the Arch-Bishop cauſeth the Kings Letters Patents to be produced and read, which require the Arch Bishop to conſecrate him a *Bishop.* There is a ſecond expreſſion.

Thirdly the new Bishop takes his oath of canonicall obedience, *I A B elected Bishop of the Church and See of* C. *do profeſſe and promiſe all reverence and due obedience to the Arch Bishop and Metropoliticall Church of D. and his Succeſſours. So God help me &c.* This is a third Expreſſion.

Next the Arch Bishop exhorts the whole Aſſembly to ſolemne praier for this perſon thus elected and preſented, before they

they admit him to that office (that is the Office of a Bishop,) whereunto they hope he is called by the holy Ghost, after the example of Christ before he did chuse his Apostles, and the church of Antioch before they laid hands upon Paul and Barnabas. This is a fourth expression.

Then followeth the *Litany*, wherein there is this expresse petition for the person to be ordeined Bishop, *we beseech thee to give thy blessing and grace to this our brother elected Bishop, that he may discharge that office whereunto he is called diligently to the Edification of thy Church.* To which all the congregation answer, *Heare us O Lord we beseech thee.* Here is a fifth expression.

Then followeth this praier wherewith the *Litany* is concluded. *Allmighty God, the giver of all good things, which by thy holy Spirit hast constituted diverse orders of Ministers in thy Church, vouchsafe we beseech thee to looke graciously upon this thy servant, now called to the Office of a Bishop.* This is a sixth expression.

Next the Arch-Bishop telleth him he must examine him, before he admit him to that administratiō whereunto he is called, and maketh a solemne praier for him, that *God who hath constituted some Prophets, some Apostles &c. to the Edification of his Church,*

Church, would grant to this his ſervant the grace to uſe the authority committed to him, to edification not deſtruction, to diſtribute food in due ſeaſon to the family of Chriſt, as becommeth a faithfull and prudent Steward. This authority can be no other then Epiſcopall authority, nor this Stewardship any other thing then Episcopacy. This is a ſeventh expreſſiō.

Then followeth impoſition of hands, by the Arch-Biſhop and all the Biſhops preſent, with theſe words *Receive the holy Ghoſt* &c: and laſtly the tradition of the Bible into his hands, exhorting him *to behave himſelf towards the flock of Chriſt, as a Paſtour, not devouring but feeding the flock.* All this implieth Epiſcopall authority. They may except againſt Chriſts owne forme of ordeining his Apoſtles if they will, and againſt the forme uſed by their owne Church: but if they be ſufficient formes, our forme is ſufficient. This was the ſame forme which was uſed in Edward the ſixths time, and we have ſeen how Cardinall Pole and Paul the fourth confirmed all without exception, that were ordeined according to this forme; ſo they would reunite themſelves to the Roman Catholick Church.

They bring the very ſame objection againſt our Prieſtly Ordination, *The forme*

or words whereby men are made Priests must expresse authority and power to consecrate, or make present Christs body and blood, (whether with or without transubstantiation is not the present controversy with Protestants.) Thus far we accorde, to the truth of the presence of Christs body and blood; So they leave us this latitude for the manner of his presence. Abate us Transubstantiation, and those things which are consequents of their determination of the manner of presence, and we have no difference with them in this particular. They who are ordeined Priests, ought to have power to consecrate the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, that is, to make them present after such manner as they were present at the first institution; whether it be done by enunciation of the words of Christ, as it is observed in the westerne Church, or by praier, as it is practised in the Easterne Church; or whether these two be both the same thing in effect, that is, that the formes of the Sacraments be mysticall praiers and implicite invocations. Our Church for more abundant caution useth both formes, as well in the Consecration of the Sacrament, as in the ordination of Priests. In the holy Eucharist, our consecration is a repetition of that which was done by Christ, and now done by

by him that consecrateth in the person of Christ: otherwise the Priest could not say *this is my body*. And likewise in Episcopall Consecration, *Homo imponit manus, deus largitur gratiam, Sacerdos imponit supplicem dexteram, Deus benedicit potente dextera: Man imposeth hands, God conferreth grace, The Bishop imposeth his suppliant right hand, God blesseth with his Almighty right hand.* In both consecrations Christ himself is the chiefe consecrater still, Then if power of consecratiõ be nothing els but power to do that which Christ did, and ordeined to be done, our Priests want not power to consecrate. They adde, *in all formes of Ordeining Priests, that ever were used in the Easterne or Westerne Church, is expresly set downe the word Priest, or some other words expressing the proper function and authority of Priesthood &c. The Grecians using the word Priest or Bishop in their formes, do sufficiently expresse the respective power of every Order. But our Reformers did not put into the forme of ordeining Priests, any words expressing authority to make Christs body present.* I answer, that if by formes of ordeining Priests, they understãd that essentiall forme of words, which is used at the same instant of time whilest hands are imposed, I denie that in all formes of Priestly ordination, the word Priest is set downe either expresly

or æquivalently. It is set downe expresly in the Easterne Church, it is not set downe expresly in the Westerne Church. Both the Easterne and Westerne formes are lawfull, but the Westerne commeth nearer to the institution of Christ.

But if by formes of Ordeining, they understand Ordinalls or Ritualls, or the intire forme of ordeining: both our Church and their Church have not onely æquivalent expressions of Priestly power, but even the expresse word *Priest* it self, which is sufficient both to direct and to expresse the intention of the Consecrater. Vnder that name the Arch Deacon preſēteth them, *Right Reverend Father in Christ, I present unto you these persons here present, to be admitted to the Order of Priesthood.* Vnder that name the Bishop admitteth them, *well beloved brethren, these are they whom we purpose by the grace of God this day to admit* [cooptare] *into the holy office of Priesthood.* Vnder this name the whole assembly praieth for them, *Almighty God, vouchsafe we beseech thee to looke graciously upon these thy servants, which this day are called to the office of Priesthood.* It were to be wished, that writers of Controversies would make more use of their owne eyes, and trust lesse other mens citations.

Secondly I answer, that it is not necessa-

ry

ry, that the eſſentiall formes of Sacraments should be alwaies ſo very expreſſe and determinate, that the words are not capable of extenſion to any other matter: if they be as determinate and expreſſe, as the example and preſcription of Chriſt, it is ſufficient. The forme of baptiſme is, *I baptiſe the in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*: Not I baptiſe the to *Regeneration*, or for *Remiſſion of ſins*. There are many other kinds of baptiſmes or waſhings, beſides this Sacramentall baptiſme: yet this forme is as large as the inſtitution of Chriſt. And theſe generall words are efficacious both to regeneration and remiſſion of ſinnes, as well as if regeneration and remiſſion of ſins had bene expreſly mentioned. In this forme of baptiſme, there is enough antecedent to direct and regulate both the actions and intentions of the Miniſter: So there is likewiſe in our forme of Ordination.

Thirdly I anſwer, that in our very eſſentiall forme of Prieſtly Ordination, Prieſtly power and authority is ſufficiently expreſſed; we need not ſeeke for a needle in a bottle of hay. The words of our Ordinall are cleare enough. Firſt *Receive the Holy Ghoſt*, (That is the grace of the holy Ghoſt) *to exerciſe and diſcharge the Office of Prieſthood*

hood, to which thou haſt been now preſented, to which thou haſt been now accepted, and for which we have praied to God, that in it thou maieſt diſſcharge thy duty faithfully and acceptably.

Secondly, in theſe words, *whoſe ſins thou doeſt remit they are remitted,* that is not onely by Prieſtly abſolution: but by preaching, by baptiſing, by adminiſtring the holy Euchariſt, which is a meanes to applie the alſufficient ſacrifice of Chriſt, for the remiſſion of Sinnes. He who authoriſeth a man to accomplish a worke, doth authoriſe him to uſe all meanes which tend to the accomplishment thereof.

That which is objected, that *Laymen have power to remit ſinnes by Baptiſme, but no power to conſecrate,* ſignifieth nothing as to this point. For firſt their owne Doctors do acknowledge, that *a Lay man can not baptiſe ſolemnely, nor in the preſence of a Prieſt or a Deacon, nor in their abſence, except onely in caſe of neceſſity.* Saint *Auſtin* gives the reaſon, becauſe *no man may invade anothers office.* Laymen may, and are bound to inſtruct others in caſe of neceſſity: yet the office of preaching and inſtructing others is Conferred by Ordination. The ordinary office of remitting ſinnes, both by baptiſme and by the holy Euchariſt, doth belong to Bishops and under thē to Prieſts.

Bell. de Sac. Bapt. l. 1. c. 7.

Thirdly

Thirdly, this Prieſtly power to conſecrate is conteined in theſe words, *Be thou a faithfull diſpenſer of the word of God, and Sacraments.* And afterwards, when the Biſhop delivers the holy Bible into the hands of thoſe who are ordeined Prieſts, *Have thou authority to preach the word of God, and Adminiſter the Sacraments.* We do not deny, but Deacons have been admitted to diſtribute and Miniſter the Sacraments, by the Command or permiſſion of Prieſts, or as Subſervient unto them: but there is as much difference between a ſubſerviēt diſtributiō of the Sacrament, and the *Diſpenſing* or *Adminiſtring* of it, as there is betweene the Office of a Porter who diſtributeth the almes at the gate, and the Office of the Steward who is the proper diſpenſer of it. Looke to it Gentlemen; If your owne Ordination be valide, Ours is as valide, and more pure.

They make the cauſe of theſe defects in our forme of Ordination, to be, becauſe *Zuinglianiſme and Puritaniſme did prevaile in the English Church in thoſe daies. They believed not the reall preſence: therefore they put no word in their forme expreſſing power to conſecrate. They held Epiſcopacy and Prieſthood to be one and the ſame thing: Therefore they put not in one word expreſſing the Epiſcopall Function.* This is called leaping over the ſtile before a man

a man comes at it, To deviſe reaſons of that which never was. Firſt prove our defects, if you can: And then find out as many reaſons of them as you liſt. But to ſay the truth; the cauſe and the effect are well coupled together. The cauſe, that is the Zuinglianiſme of our predeceſſours, never had any reall exiſtence in the nature of things, but onely in theſe mēs imaginations: So the defects of our Ordinalls are not reall but imaginary. Herein the Fathers adventured to farre, to tell us that we have nothing in our formes of Ordeining, to expreſſe either the Prieſtly or Epiſcopall funcțiō: when every child that is able to reade can tell them, that we have the expreſſe words of Bishops and Priests in our Formes, over and over againe, And mainteine to all the the world that *the three Orders, of Bishops Prieſts and Deacons, have been ever from the beginning in the Church of Chriſt.*

In præfatione.

This they ſay *is the true reaſon, why Parker and his Collegues were contented with the Nagges head Conſecration,* (that is to ſay, one brainſick whimſey is the reaſon of another): *and why others recurred to extraordinary vocation in Queene Eliſabeths time.* Say what others? name one genuine ſon of the Church of England if you can? Doctor *Whitakers*, and Doctor *Fulke*, who are the onely two men

men mentioned by you, are both professedly against you. Doctor *Whitakers* saith *we do not condemne all the Order of Bishops, as he falsely slanders us, but onely the false Bishops of the Church of Rome.* And Doctor Fulke, *for Order and seemely goverment among the Clergy, there was allwaies one Principall, to whom the name of Bishop or Superintendent hath been applied, which roome* Titus *exercised in* Crete, Timothy *in* Ephesus, *others in other Places.* Adding, that *the Ordination, or Consecration, by imposition of hands, was alwaies principally committed to him.*

De Eccles. cont. 2. q 5 c. 3

In Titum c. 1

The Fathers proceed, *If Mr.* Lawd *had found successe in his first attempts, it is very credible, he would in time have reformed the Forme of the English Ordination.* That pious and learned Prelate wanted not other degrees in Church and Schooles, which they omit. He was a great lover of peace, but too judicious to dance after their pipe, too much versed in Antiquity to admit their new matter and forme, or to attempt to correct the *Magnificat* for satisfaction of their humours. But whence had they this credible Relation? We are very confident, they have neither Authour nor ground for it, but their owne imagination. And if it be so, what excuse they have for it in their Case Divinity, they know best: but in ours we could not excuse it from down right calumny.

They

They have such an eye at our order and uniformity, that they can not let our *long Cloakes and Surplesses* alone. We never had any such animosities among us about our Cloakes, as some of their Religious Orders have had about their gownes: both for the colour of them, whether they should be black, or white, or gray, or the naturall Colour of the sheep; And for the fashion them, whether they should belong or short &c, in so much as two Popes successively could not determine it.

If Mr. *Mason* did commend the wisedome of the English Church, for paring away superfluous Ceremonies in Ordination, he did well. Ceremonies are advancements of Order, decency, modesty, and gravity in the service of God, Expressions of those heavenly desires and dispositions, which we ought to bring along with us to Gods house, Adjuments of attention and devotion, Furtherances of Edification, visible instructers, helps of Memory, exercises of faith, the shell that preserves the Kernell of Religion from contempt, the leaves that defend the blossomes and the fruite; but if they grow over thick and ranke, they hinder the fruite from comming to maturity, and then the Gardiner pluckes them of. There is great difference be-

tween

tween the hearty expreſſions of a faithfull Friend, and the mimicall geſtures of a fawning flatterer; betweē the unaffected comeleneſſe of a grave Matrone, and the phantaſticall paintings, and patchings, and powderings, of a garish Curteſan.

When Ceremonies become burthenſome by exceſſive ſuperfluity, or unlawfull Ceremonies are obtruded, or the Subſtance of divine worship is placed in Circumſtances, or the ſervice of God is more reſpected for humane ornaments then for the Divine Ordinance; it is high time to pare away exceſſes, and reduce things to the ancient meane.

Theſe Fathers are quite out, where they make it lawfull at ſome times to adde, but never to pare away: yet we have pared away nothing, which is either preſcribed or practiſed by the true Catholick Church. If our Anceſtors have pared away any ſuch things out of any miſtake, (which we do not beleeve,) let it be made appeare evidently to us, and we are more ready to welcome it againe at the foredore, then our Anceſtours were to caſt it out at the backdore. *Errare poſſumus hæretici eſſe nolumus.*

To conclude, as an impetuous wind doth not blow downe thoſe trees which are well radicated

radicated, but causeth them to spread their rootes more firmely in the earth: so these concussions of our Adversaries, do confirme us in the undoubted assurance of the truth, and validity, and legality of our holy Orders. We have no more reason to doubt of the truth of our Orders, because of the different judgment of an handfull of our partiall countrymen, and some few forreine Doctors misinformed by them: then they themselves have to doubt of the truth of their Orders who were ordeined by *Formosus*, because two Popes *Stephen* and *Sergius* one after another, out of passion and prejudice, declared them to be voide and invalide.

But supposing that which we can never grant, without betraying both our selves and the truth, that there were some remote probabilities, that might occasion suspicion in some persons prepossessed with prejudice, of the legality of our Orders: yet for any man upon such pretended uncerteinties, to leave the communion of that Church wherein he was baptised, which gave him his Christian being, and to Apostate to them, where he shall meet with much greater grounds of feare, both of Schisme and Idolatry; were to plõge himself in a certein crime, for feare of an

an uncertein danger.

Here the Fathers make a briefe repetition of whatsoever they have said before in this discourse, (either out of distrust of the Readers memory, or confidence of their owne atchievements,) of the *Nagges head*, and *Mr. Neale*, and the Protestant writers, and Bishop *Bancroft*, and Bishop *Morton* and the other Bishops that sate with him the last Parliament, (which being the onely thing alleged by them in the Authours life time, and proved so undeniably to be false, is enough to condemne all the rest of their *Heare say* reports, for groundlesse fables) of our Registers, of King *Edwards* Bishops, of Bishop *Barlow*, and of the forme of our ordination; Directing him who will cleare all those doubtes, what he hath to do, as if we were their Iournymen. Let them not trouble themselves about that, they are cleared to the least graine.

But if they will receive advise for advise, and pursue a prudentiall course which they prescribe to others; if they regard the present face of the skie, and looke well to their owne interest, and the present conjuncture of their affaires: they have more need and are more ingaged in reputation to defend themselves, then to oppugne others.

So they conclude their discourse with this

this short Corollary, *How unfortunately was Charles the first late King of England, misinformed in matter of his Bishops and Clergy? what scruple could he have had, if he had known the truth, to give way to the Parliament, to pull downe Parliament Bishops, who were so farre from being* de jure divino, *that they were not so much as* de jure Ecclesiastico? We thanke you Gentlemen for your good will, The Orthodox Clergy of *England* are your feare. And you know what commonly followeth after feare, Hate, *Oderunt quos metuunt.* What pitty it is that you were not of King *Charles* his Councell, to have advised him better? yet we observe few Princes thrive worse, then where you pretend to be great ministers. If you had counsailed him upon this Subject, perhaps you might have found him too hard for you; as another did whose heart he burst with downe right reason. If ever that innocent King had a finger in the blood of any of that party, that was it, to choake a man with reason: but certeinly that wise Prince would not have much regarded your positive conclusions, upon hearsay premisses.

We hold our Benefices by human right, our offices of Priests and Bishops both by divine right and humane right. But put the case we did hold our Bishopricks onely by

by humane right, Is it one of your cases of conscience, that a Soveraigne Prince may justly take away from his Subjects any thing which they hold by humane right? If one man take from another that which he holds justly by the law of man, he is a thief and a robber by the law of God. Let us alter the case a little, from our Bishoprickes to their Colleges or their treasures: If any man should attempt to take them from them, upon this ground because they held them but by humane right, they would quickly cry out with *Ploiden*, *the case is altered*. Be our right divine, or humane, or both, if we be not able to defend it against any thing the Fathers can bring against it, we deserve to lose it.

FINIS.

Errata.

P. 14 l. 9. r. *that* the. p. 15. l. 22. r. *as* to. p. 18. l. 9. and p. 19. l. 10. r. *Tobie*, p. 20. l. 20. r. *requested*. p. 23. l. 2. d. *presens*. p. 30. l. 2 r. *Chapel*. p. 37. l. 23. r. *to* present. p. 40. Marg. lib 3. p 47. l. 1. r. *chap.* 4 and in like manner correct the number of the chapter, till chap. 11. p. 63. l. 21. r. temporal, *and commons* in p. 76. l. 20. r. 1599. p. 77. l. 8. Rolles r. *Acts*. p. 82. l. 20. r. *Acidem Decanus & Capitulum* &c. And p. 86. ad l. 24. Marg. add. Rot. par. 14. 2. Exab. p. 101 l. 10 r. *Commissarii*. l. 19. assensu. r. *Consilio* p. 104. l. 1. Marg. add. *Regist. Parker. Tom.* I *fol.* 10. l. 12. r. per *Thomam Yale* l. 25. r. se *adjunxit*. p. 105 l. 7. r. dixerunt *Anglice. take* &c. as in the Preface, p. 108. l. 25. r. John *Incent*, p. 117. l. 11. r. Metropolitano salutem, &c. p. 127. l. 7. d. *of*. p. 154. l. 1. d. *that*. p. 162. l. 14. r. 1572. p. 168. l. 14 ry. r. *merry* and for *w.* r. *we*. p. 188. l. 7. r. *Esily* p. 190. l. ult. r. 31. *Jul.* p. 191. l. 12. r. *num.* 27. p. 200. l. 19. r. *september* 9. p. 211. l. 20. p. 212. l. 12. and p. 213. l. 10. for Dean of the Arches r. *Archbishop or his Commissioner*.